

A 223 6 23  
COLLECTION  
OF  
TRACTS,  
STATING

Some Important POINTS

Relating to the

*Deity, Worship, and Satisfaction* of the  
Lord JESUS CHRIST, &c.

VIZ,

- I. An Humble Inquiry into the Scripture-Account of the Deity of JESUS CHRIST.
- II. A Vindication of the Worship of JESUS CHRIST, on the Unitarian Principles, in answer to Mr. J. Boyse.
- III. The Supreme Deity of GOD the Father demonstrated, against Dr. Sherlock.
- IV. A Vindication of the Bishop of Gloucester from the Charge of Heresy by Dr. Sherlock.
- V. Remarks on Mr. Lesley's Dialogue against the Socinians.
- VI. A Vindication of the Remarks.
- VII. An Examination of Mr. Lesley's last Dialogue about the Satisfaction of JESUS CHRIST, and Dr. Stillingfleet's *Reasons of Christ's Sufferings*.
- VIII. A Query, Whether (on Mr. Wall's Principles) Christian Baptism was intended by CHRIST for any but such as be profelyted to Christianity from Infidelity?

---

By THOMAS EMLYN, a Sufferer in this Cause.

---

2 Tim. II. 9. *Wherein I suffer trouble as an Evil-Doer, even unto Bonds;*  
*but the Lord is with me, and he will deliver me.*





An Humble  
**I N Q U I R Y**  
I N T O T H E  
**S C R I P T U R E - A C C O U N T**  
O F  
**J E S U S C H R I S T :**  
O R , A  
**S H O R T A R G U M E N T**  
Concerning  
**H i s D e i t y a n d G l o r y ,**  
According to the  
**G O S P E L .**

---

*I Cor. viii. 5. To us there is but One God, and he is the Father, of whom are all things; and One Lord, viz. Jesus Christ, through whom are all things.*

---

*Augus. cont. Maxim. l. 3. c. 14.*

*Nec ego Nicenam Synodum tibi, nec tu Ariminensem mihi, debes ob-  
jicere. Scripturarum Authoritatibus, &c.*

*Thou shalt not urge me with the Council of Ariminum, nor I thee with the  
Council of Nice, but let us decide the Cause by Scripture Authority.*

---

Printed in the Year M DCC II.



TESTUS CHRISTI

SHORT ARGUMENT

Concerning

the Trinity and Unity



1 Cor. viii. 4. To wit there is but One God, and he is the Father  
of whom are all things; and One Lord, Jesus Christ,  
through whom are all things.

hanc ego Nicenum synodum fidei, nec in universum, sed  
hanc Scripturam auctoritatem habere, etc.  
This shall not argue us with the Council of Nicaena, nor I too with the  
Council of Nice, but it is the Word of God, by whose authority

Printed in the Year MDCCLII

A  
T  
nian  
what  
is in  
or m  
reaso  
given  
ture.  
I.  
Perf  
alon  
thor  
is w  
we f  
in  
in th  
2.  
and  
are  
and  
Thur  
Thom  
God  
rate  
10.

A Short

## ARGUMENT,

Concerning the

DEITY of our  
LORD JESUS CHRIST.

**T**HAT the Blessed Jesus has the Title of God ascribed sometimes to him in the H. Scriptures, is not denied by *Arians*, or *Soci-nians*; but it remains to be Examined in what Sense that Character, as given to him, is intended. Nor is this an unreasonable or needless enquiry, since it is beyond all reasonable denial, that the Title of *God* is given in very different Senses in the Scripture.

1. Sometimes it signifies the most High, Perfect and Infinite Being, who is of himself alone, and owes neither his Being nor Authority, nor any thing to another: and this is what is most commonly intended, when we speak of *God* in ordinary discourse, and in Prayer and Praise; we mean it of *God* in the most eminent Sense.

2. At other times it has a lower Sense, and is made the Character of Persons who are invested with Subordinate Authority and Power, from that Supreme Being. Thus *Angels* are stiled *Gods*. *Pf.* 97. 7. *Pf.* 8. 5. *Thou hast made him a little lower than the Gods*; as 'tis in the *Margine*: So *Magistrates* are *Gods*, *Ex.* 22. 28. *Pf.* 82. 1. *John* 10. 34, 35. And sometimes in the singular

number, one Person is stiled *God*, as *Moses* is twice so called, a *God* to *Aaron*, *Ex.* 4. 16. and afterwards a *God* to *Pharaoh*, *Ch.* 7. 1. and thus the Devil is called the *God* of this World, *i. e.* the Prince and mighty Ruler of it; tho by unjust Usurpation, and God's Permission. Now as he who alone is *God*, in the former Sense, is infinitely above all these; so we find him distinguish'd from all others who are called *God*, by this Character, *viz.* a *God of Gods*, *Deut.* 10. 17. so *Jos.* 22. 22. or the Chief of all *Gods*, with whom none of those *Gods* may be compared. *Pf.* 86. 8. *Pf.* 135. 5. So *Philo* describes him, to be not only the *God of Men*, but the *God of Gods* also. This is the highest and most glorious Epithete given him in the O. T. when it is designed to make a most magnificent mention of his Peerless Greatness and Glory. Equivalent to this I take that Title to be, which is so much used in the N. T. *viz.* the *God and Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ, *Eph.* 1. 3, 17. *the God of our Lord Jesus, the Father of Glory*. For since Jesus Christ is the Chief of all Subordinate Powers, *Rev.* 1. 5. *the Prince of the Kings of the Earth*, and far above the greatest *Angels*, *Eph.* 1. 21. the

B

Lord



*Lord of Lords, and King of Kings*, he who is stiled the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, is therein, in Effect, stiled the God of Gods, or above all Gods.

Now the Question to be resolved is, in which of these two Senses Christ is said to be God in the Holy Scriptures; the bare Character of *God* determines nothing in this case, because it belongs both to the Supreme and Subordinate Beings in Power and Authority: But the Question is, whether Jesus Christ be the God of Gods, or above all Gods?

He is indeed the *Lord of Lords*, but that notes an Inferior Character, compared with that of *God of Gods*, as appears by that, 1 Cor. 8. 5. tho it be included in the Superior, so that he who is above all Gods, is also over all Lords, but not contrariwise. *In short*, has Jesus Christ any God over him, who has greater Authority, and greater Ability than himself, or not? This will decide the matter: for if he have a God above him, then is he not the Absolutely Supreme God, tho in Relation to Created Beings, he may be a God (or Ruler) over all.

Nor can we more clearly demonstrate this point, than by shewing; *First*, that Jesus Christ expressly speaks of another God than himself. *Secondly*, that he owns this God to be above or over himself. *Thirdly*, That he wants those Supereminent and Infinite Perfections, which belong only to the Lord God of Gods. Of these I shall treat in a manner suited to vulgar Capacities; for I judge it very indecent to speak or write of Important Articles, (which the Common People must believe, and must so far understand) in such a manner as leaves them wholly unintelligible.

*First*, Our Lord Jesus Christ expressly speaks of another God distinct from himself: Several times, we find him saying, *My God* of another, *Mat.* 27. 46. *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* So *John* 20. 17. sure he intended not to say, my

Self, my Self, why hast thou forsaken me? This God then was distinct from himself, as he declares in other places, *John* 7. 17. *he shall know my Doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.* So *John* 8. 42. where 'tis to be noted that he does not distinguish himself from him, as the *Father*, but as *God*; and therefore, in all just Construction, he cannot be supposed to be that self-same God, from whom he distinguishes, and to whom he opposeth himself. How manifestly are the one God, and the one Lord distinguish'd, 1 Cor. 8. 6. And that there may be no just pretence to say with *Placens*, that the God and the Lord, or the Cause of which all things are, and the Cause by or through which they are, are but two things said of the same one God; we may see them more clearly distinguish'd, *Eph.* 4. 5, 6. where by the interposing other things between the one Lord, and one God, *viz. one Faith, one Baptism*; it appears evidently that these were not intended as two Characters of the same Being. I think that none who impartially attends to the Scripture-History, can doubt, whether God, and his Christ, are not two distinct things.

*Secondly*, Our Lord Jesus owns not only another than himself to be God; but also that he is above, or over himself, which is plainly intimated also by his Apostles: Himself loudly proclaims his Subjection to the Father in many Instances: In general, he declares his *Father to be greater than he*, *John* 14. 28, 30. *Ch.* 10. 29. he says he came not in his own, but his *Father's* Name or Authority, *John* 5. 43. That he sought not his own, but God's Glory, nor made his own Will, but God's, his Rule; and in such a Posture of Subjection he came down from Heaven into this Earth: so that it should seem, that Nature which did pre-exist, did not possess the Supreme Will, even before it was incarnate, *John* 6. 38. Again he owns his dependance upon his God and Father, even for those Things, which

which  
God,  
John  
of ex  
all w  
nothi  
decla  
as his  
phati  
God  
Hum  
Hea  
decla  
the v  
and  
Gift  
and  
ries  
L  
grea  
for p  
Fath  
to t  
Thi  
I  
Chr  
to b  
man  
Thi  
this  
und  
that  
mus  
of t  
it n  
as t  
have  
out  
Apo  
triu  
to v  
bed  
it w  
cept  
caul  
enal  
him  
2

which it is pretended belong to him as God, viz. the Power of working Miracles, *John* 5. 19, 20. of raising the Dead, *v.* 26. of executing universal Judgment, *v.* 27. of all which he says, *of my own self I can do nothing*, *v.* 30. In like manner his Apostles declare his Subjection to another, not only as his Father, but *as his God*, which is emphatically expressed, in calling the most B. God, *the God of our Lord Jesus*, after his Humiliation was over, *Eph.* 1. 17. and the *Head of Christ is God*, *1 Cor.* 11. They declare his *Headship* over the Universe, and the very Foundations of his Claim to Honour and Service; to be owing to the gracious Gift of God, *Phil.* 2. 9. *ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτῶν*. and yet these are some of the highest Glories of Jesus Christ.

Let me only add under this Head, that great Text, so full of irresistible evidence, for proving an Inferiority in the Son to his Father, or to God, *1 Cor.* 15. from the 24. *v.* to the 29. where the Apostle says several Things to this purpose.

1. That all things are to be put under *Christ's Feet*; all Enemies and Powers are to be subdued to him: But adds, that 'tis manifest, *God must be excepted* out of these Things that are under him; and that for this reason, because 'tis he who did put all under him. And how comes it to pass, that it is so evident a Thing, that another must be supposed to be the great Author of this Triumph of Christ? Why might it not be done by himself independently as the Supreme God, and then there need have been no exception, of any one *Being*, out of the all things under him? But the Apostle knew that Jesus Christ must needs triumph by a Power deriv'd from God, to whom it was most eminently to be ascribed; and then to one who had such thoughts, it was manifest that there must be one excepted from the all Things under him, because he must needs be above Christ who enables him to subdue all things, or *makes him a God over all*.

2. The Son shall deliver his Kingdom

to God, that is (not to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as some pretend, but) the Father only; since it was the Father, *Mat.* 28. 18. who gave him all Power in Heaven and Earth, and who made him *King in Zion*: Into his Hands he will make a Surrender of all, in Testimony of his having done all in a Subordination to him; and having Acted and Ruled in dependance on him, who shall have a Satisfactory Account of all given to him in the end. This is a Glory peculiar to the Father, as Supreme.

3. Then the Son himself shall be Subject to him that put all things under him, i. e. to God his Father, that God may be all in all; that is, his Subjection shall be then manifested by an open solemn acknowledgment of it, when he shall recognize the Supremacy of the Father in that publick Act of Surrender: so that, tho formerly (*in the present State*) all Judgment and Rule was committed to the Son; yet then it shall be otherwise, and God will more immediately appear in the Government of the future State, which shall not be so much shared probably, between him and the Redeemer, as the present Administration appears to be. This then will be the Issue of all our Disputes; *God all in all*, and the Son himself Subject under him. Can any thing be more Expressive of an Inequality between God and Christ?

But it will be said by some, That by the Son here, is meant the Son of Man, or Christ as Man; while as God, he shall not be subjected to the Father.

Res. As there is no intimation of any such distinction between the pretended two Natures of the Son here; so there is enough in the Words, to shew, that they are spoken of him, under his Highest Capacity and Character; insomuch, that Monsieur Claude maintains it to be true of the Son of God, as to his (supposed) Divine Nature. But tho there is no need of Supposing such a Nature, (which I think the Text plainly contradicts) yet his



his Reasons will hold so far, as to prove the Words do speak of Christ, under the Highest Character he bears, by the Name of Son; for *First*, as he says, 'tis not said the *Son of Man*, but the *Son* absolutely, which he thinks in the Scripture-Use is wont to mean more than the Son of Man; and undoubtedly it imports all that comes under that Title: Nay more, 'tis said, *even the Son himself* with great Emphasis, *qu. d.* as Great and Glorious as he is with all his Grandeur and Power, he *himself* shall be Subject. *Secondly*, His Subjection being opposed to his Reign, both must be understood of the same Subject; be sure the delivering up the Kingdom can only be done by the same to which it was committed, and by which it was managed: Now I shall allow, that only in his humane Nature Christ cou'd give up his Kingdom; but then 'tis, *because* 'tis as Man delegated, and inhabited by God, that he sways and manages this Kingdom; and if this be allow'd (as I think it needs must) that the Man Christ is sufficient, by help from God, to manage his Universal Spiritual Kingdom, I see no reason there will be to oppose those *Unitarians* who think him to be a sufficient Saviour and Prince, tho he be not the only Supream God; nor can any with reason attempt to prove him to be such, from his Works and Office as King of his Church, since 'tis implied that as such, he must do Homage to God the Father, in *delivering up his Kingdom to him*; and this very expression *to God the Father*, makes it plain, that there is no God the Son, in the same Sense, or in the same Supream Essence with the Father; because if there were, then he ought not to be excluded from this Glory of having such open Homage paid to him, which is here appropriated to the Father only. And since the Apostle speaks of the same God, (whom he explains to be the Father) to the end of this Discourse, and says he shall be *all in all*: How evidently do's he shew him to be far beyond all that are *not* God the Fa-

ther, whatever Character else they bear? So then, Jesus Christ in his Highest Capacity, is inferiour to the Father; how can he be the same God, to which he is subject, or of the same Rank and Dignity?

Thus it appears that Christ is so God, as to be under a Superiour God, who has set him over all: And suitable to this, is that Account which the Scripture gives us of the Godhead of the B. Jesus, *viz.* Because he is invested with a God-like Authority and Power, from the Supream God his Father. Thus when he was accused by the captious *Jews*, for assuming the Character of Son of God (which they perversly wou'd stretch, as tho it imply'd an equality with God) *John* 10. 35, 36. he explains in what Sense only he justify'd it, *viz.* as one whom the Father had Sanctified, *i. e.* called to a greater Office, and honoured with a Higher Commission than those Magistrates, on whom the Scripture so freely bestows the Title of *Gods*. So *Heb.* 1. 8, 9. when he is called God, 'tis explained in what Sense, or of what sort of God. 'Tis to be understood, by saying that *his* God (intimating he had a God over him) had *anointed him with Oyl*, &c. That is, had invested him with Royal Power and Dignity (as Kings were installed in their Office, by anointing with Oyl, among the *Jews*) which is an Explication of his God-head or Dominion: And this is said to be *above all his Fellows*, not sure above the Father and Holy Spirit, (which only are pretended to be his Fellows, as God, by them who understand it of the Supream God-head) but above all other Subordinate Beings. This is one plain Scripture-Account of his being called God, for these Things are spoken to him, and of him, under the Character of God. *O God, Thy Throne*, &c. *v.* 8. I think men shou'd be well assured on what Grounds they go, before they assign other reasons of this Character, so different from the Scripture Account: Let it suffice us, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, *Acts* 2. 36. that he has exalted him to be a Prince and Saviour, *Ch.* 5. 31.

How-

However, our Adversaries will gain nothing by alledging Texts to prove the Title of God to be given to Christ, since that may be, and yet it will not prove him to be the Supream independent God, but only one who is inhabited of, and commissioned and enabled by him who is so. *As to that place, Philip. 2. 6. which is Corruptly rendred in our Translation; he thought it no Robbery to be equal to God:* It is confess'd by adversaries themselves, that it shou'd be read thus, viz. that he did not *assume*, or *Arrogate*, or *Snatch at*, or *Covet* an equality with God; the Words are never known to be used in any other Sense, as is shown by Doctor Tillotson in his Discourses against the Socinians; also by Dr. Whitby in his Exposition on the place, and others. So that this rather denies than asserts Christs equality to God, tho still he was in the *Form of God*, as that Notes the outward Resemblance of him in his mighty Power and Works, &c. which is the constant meaning of the word *form* in the New Testament.

But because some think such Perfections are in Scripture ascribed to Christ, as will prove him to be God in the highest Sense, proceed to shew;

*Thirdly,* That our Blessed Lord Jesus Disclaims those Infinite perfections which belong only to the Supream God of Gods. And 'tis most certain, that if he want one, or any of these Perfections that are Essential to the Deity; He is not God in the Chief sense: And if we find him disclaiming the *One*, he cannot challenge the *Other*; or to deny Himself to have all Divine Perfections; or to deny Himself to be the infinite God, is the same Thing: Let us observe some Instances for the Proof of this point.

1. One Great and Peculiar Perfection of the Deity, is Absolute, underived Omnipotence: He who cannot Work all Miracles, and do whatever he List of himself, without help from Another,

can never be the Supream Being, or God; Because he appears to be an *Imperfect*, Defective Being, Comparatively, since he needs help, and can Receive additional Strength from Another than Himself.

Now, it is most evident, that our Lord Jesus (whatever Power he had) Confesses again and again, that he had not Infinite Power of Himself, *John 5. 30. Of my self I can do nothing.* He had been Speaking of great Miracles, viz. Raising the Dead, and Executing all Judgment; but all along takes Care, Men shou'd know that His Sufficiency for these Things was of God the Father. In the beginning of the Discourse, *v. 19. the Son can do nothing but what he sees the Father do:* So in the *Middle. v. 26, 27. the Father has given to the Son to have life in Himself;* and as if he cou'd never too much Inculcate this great Truth, he adds towards the Conclusion; *I can do nothing of my self ἀπ' ἑμαυτοῦ*, or from nothing that is my Self do I draw this Power and Authority. Sure this is not the Voice of God, but of a Man! For the most High can Receive from none; he cannot be made more Mighty or Wise, &c. because to Absolute Perfection can be no Addition, *Rom. 11. 35.* And since Power in God, is an Essential Perfection; it follows, that if it be derived, Then so is the Essence or Being it Self, which is Blasphemy against the Most High, for 'tis to *Ungod* Him; to Number Him among Poor Dependent Derivative Beings; Whilst the Supream God indeed, is only he who is the *First Cause*, and Absolute Original of all.

Nay further, Our Lord considers Himself here, in Opposition to his Father; who he says, gave him all Power: Now if he had such an *Eternal Divine Word*, United more nearly to Him than the Father; Surely he wou'd have owned his Power to be from that Word or Divine Son.



How comes he to Ascribe nothing to that, since 'tis supposed to be equal in Power to the Father Himself, and more nearly Allied to Jesus Christ, as the Operating Principle in Him? So *John* 14. 10. *My Father in me does the Works*; by which, 'tis evident there was no Divine Agent in and with Him, but the Father; He only has all Power of Himself, and needs no Assistance.

2. Another Infinite Perfection, that must needs be in the Deity, is Supream Absolute Goodness: *All Nations* have consented to this by the Light of Nature; that *T'azabon*, & *Optimus Maximus*, are the Prime Characters of the Supream; as the Orator says, he is One, *quò nec Melius, nec Majus concipi Potest*: The Fullest, and Highest of all that are called Good; For indeed all other Good is derived from Him.

Now the Lord Jesus expressly Disclaims this Character, *Mat.* 19. 17. Jesus said to him, *Why callest thou me Good? there is none Good but one, that is God*; where 'tis most evident that he distinguishes Himself from God; as not the same with Him, and denies of Himself, what he affirms of God: And as to that Divine Perfection of Supream Infinite Goodness; He Challenges the Man for presuming to say what seemed to Attribute it to Him, and leads him off to Another; who, and who only was more Eminently so.

'Tis astonishing to see what Violence is Offered to the Sacred Text, by such as Maintain the Equality of Jesus Christ to God His Father: What a strange fetch is it to suppose our Lord's Meaning to be This? *qu. d. I know Man, thou dost not take Me for God as I am; Why then dost thou give Me the Title belonging to Him only?* When there is not one Word in the Context looking this Way; For Christ never Challenges the Poor Man, with this, that he thought too meanly of him (as they suppose) but quite contrary, that he Thought or Spake

too highly of Him. And verily if the Man's Error lay in this, that he thought too meanly of Christ, whilst His words otherwise were justly enough applyed to Him: I cannot think our Lord would have rebuked him in that Manner; for instead of keeping him still to the right Object, and rectifying His apprehensions about it, which only were wrong, He seems clearly to carry Him off to another from Himself, as not the right Object without rectifying His Thoughts of Christ at all; and to what End cou'd Christ Reprove Him in such a way, as never tells Him what was his Fault, rather tempts Him to run into another, and leads Him out of the Way.

It shou'd seem rather (if any such notion had been then conceiv'd by any,) that the Man did think Him to be God; for if he thought Him to be the Supream Good, that was to make Him God in his eye; and if He did not intend so much, but only meant it of an Inferior Good, how cou'd Christ rebuke Him for it, since that was no Fault or Error? And truly they who say Christ's Receiving Worship, when on Earth, proves His Deity, can hardly give an Account why the Man should give, or Christ Receive Worship from Him, as he did, *Mark* 10. 17. if he did not take him for God? However, whatsoever the Man thought, he says what Jesus Christ thought, was only proper to be said of God, and too much to be said of Himself, as the Obvious Sense of His Words declares.

And let me add, that if our Lord Jesus had on purpose left the Matter Disguis'd, not willing to discover who he was then; yet 'tis strange that the Evangelists who many Years after relate the Matter, when it was Necessary to have it believed, that Christ was Supream God (as it is pretended) that they I say, shou'd not unriddle the Matter, by inserting some Cautious Clause, as that this He said to prove Him,

him, or because he knew he denied His God-head, or the like; For *sometimes* on less Occasions they enter such *Cautions*, John 6. 6. Ch. 21. 23. And yet the *Three* of the Evangelists relate this Discourse, they all do it the same way, and not one of them says a tittle to direct us to this Secret way of Interpretation, but leaves us to the hazard of a most Fatal mistake (even Recommended to us by this History;) if Jesus Christ were indeed the Supream Good in as High a Sense as God His Father, which he so apparently here denies, and by that he denies Himself to be the most High God.

3. I will only add one Perfection more, viz. *Absolute Omniscience* or unlimited Knowledge of all Things, *Past, Present, and to come*, Ps. 147. 5. *His Understanding is Infinite*. So Isa. 41. 23. *Alls known to God are all His works from the Beginning*.

Now, 'tis plain our Lord Jesus Christ had not this Infinite Knowledge, Particularly not of *future* Things, such as of the day of Judgment, Mark 13. 32. Says he, *of that Day knows no Man, no, not the Angels in Heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only*. Here the Son professes His knowledge to be *limited*, and Inferiour to the Father, i. e. the Son of the Father, or Son of God; the Son as *above* Angels in Knowledge, the Son in the most *Eminent* Sense: Now how is it possible the Son can be God Infinite, and yet have but a finite understanding? or can he be Equal in Knowledge to the Father, and yet not know as much as the Father? And be sure if he was not an Infinite God, when on Earth, he cannot be such afterwards. Thus we have seen Christ Himself, with his own mouth *Disclaiming* Infinite Original Power, Goodness and Knowledge to belong to Him, but attributes them to his Father *only* as another, distinct from Himself, from whom he deriv'd of each in a dependent limited Manner.

What can be said against these plain Arguments? I imagine our Opposers have but one *shift* left for the evading them, and that is a distinction which serves 'em in all Cases; for *they say*, Jesus Christ speaks these Things of Himself, as *Man only*, while he had another Nature as *God*, which he Reserved, and Excepted out of the Case; So that when he says, *I cannot* do thus my Self, or I am not to be called the *Chief* Good, or do not know this, &c. according to *them*, the meaning is, *qu. d.* I have not these Perfections in my *humane Nature*, but yet I know, and can do all unassisted, and am the Chief Good in my Divine Nature, which also is more properly my Self: The Vanity of which Subterfuge I intend now to lay open, by shewing how Absurdly this Distinction of the *two Natures* is pretended, to take off the Force of such Expressions from Christs own Mouth, which in their Natural and Undisguised appearance, do proclaim His Inferiority to God, even the Father; and I shall dwell the more upon this, because 'tis the most Popular and Common Evasion, and comes in at every turn, when all other relief fails.

It would be no unreasonable Demand, to ask, what Intimation of any such *Distinction* of two Natures they can point us to, in any of these Discourses of Christ? Why shou'd Men Devise or Imagine for Him, such a Strange, and seemingly Deceitful way of Speaking, from no Ground, nor Necessity, other than that of upholding their own precarious Opinion? But I have several Remarks to make upon this common Answer.

That which in the *First* place I have to Object against it is; That Our Blessed Lord Jesus Christ, if *Himself* was the Supream God in any Nature of his *own*, Cou'd not have said such Things, (as I conceive) in any Consistency with Truth and Sincerity; (which



(which he always maintain'd strictly) he cou'd not say Himself cou'd not do, or did not know the Thing, which all this while *Himself* cou'd do, and did know very well, as besure if he was the Supream God, he cou'd and did, for this were to make Him say what is most False, and to *Equivocate* in the most deceitful manner; for tho we shou'd suppose he consisted of two Infinitely distant Natures, and so had two Capacities of Knowledg, &c. Yet since *Himself* includes them both, it follows, that the denying a Thing of *Himself* in Absolute Terms, without any Limitation in the Words, or other obvious *Circumstances*, does plainly imply a denial of its belonging to any part of His Person, or to any Nature in it; For tho we may affirm a Thing of a Person, which belongs only to a part of him; as I may properly say a Man is wounded or hurt, tho it be only in one Member, suppose an Arm; Yet I cannot justly deny a Thing of him which belongs only to one part, because it belongs not to another; as I cannot say a Man is not wounded, because tho one Arm be Shot or Wounded, yet the other is whole.

For instance, I have two Organs of sight, *two Eyes*; Now suppose I converse with a Man with one Eye *shut* and the other *open*; if being asked whether I saw him, I shou'd dare to say I saw him not (without any limitation) *meaning* to my self, that I saw him not with the Eye which was shut, tho still I saw him well enough with the Eye which was open; I fear I shou'd bear the Reproach of a Lyar and *Deceiver*, notwithstanding such a mental Reservation as some would attribute to the *Holy Jesus*. For knowledg is the *Eye* of the Person, Jesus Christ is supposed to have two of these knowing Capacities; the *one* weak, the *other* strong and peircing that discerns all Things; now as *such* an one, the Disciples repair to Him, and ask Him, when the end of the World and time of His coming shall

be? *Mat. 24. 3.* He answers them, by giving them some General Account of the Matter, but says that the particular *Day and Hour* he knew not, nor did any know but the Father, *meaning*, (say my opposers) that he knew it not with his *Humane* knowledg, tho he knew it well enough with His *Divine*, at the same time, that he said, *the Son knows it not*, absolutely and indefinitely.

And yet if Jesus Christ had a *Divine* Knowledg and Nature, no doubt his Disciples (who, if *any Body*, must be supposed to believe it) directed the question to that, rather than to the imperfect humane Capacity; and yet in answer to it, he says, *he knew not the Day*, which wou'd not be counted Sincerity or Truth in Men, much less was Jesus Christ in danger of it, in His mouth *no Guile was*; let us not impute it to Him.

That you may see this is fair reasoning, hear how some of the other side own it, when out of the heat of this controversy. See *Doctor Stillingfleet's Sermon, on Mat. 10. 16.* speaking of the *Equivocations* of Popish Priests, whose common Answer, when Examined about what they have known by Confession, is that they *know it not*, which they think to vindicate from the charge of Lying; by saying, that in *Confession, the Priest knows Matters as God, not as Man, and therefore he denies to know them, meaning it, as Man.* But says the Doctor this is absurd; because to say he does not know, is as much as to say he doth not *any way know*. Now if this be a good answer against the *Papists*, as no doubt it is; Then sure 'tis so in the present Case: Therefore when Christ says, he knows not the Day of Judgment; 'tis as much as to say he does not *any way know* it; and consequently, 'tis a vain Shift to say, it was as Man only; we must beware least we bring the Holy Jesus under such a reproach for *Equivocation*, as the Romish Priests lye under, and

and make the *Jesuits* themselves think they have a good Title to that *Name*, by imitating *herein*, his own Example; which in this very *instance* they alledg with so great Advantage according to this Interpretation.

2. As a farther Evidence, That Jesus Christ intended no such Distinction of two Natures, as is pretended; 'tis to be observed, that he puts not the *distinction*, or opposition between the Son of *Man*, and the Eternal *Word* (as some speak) but between the Son and his Father, Mark 13. 32. *Not the Son knows, but only the Father*; by which 'tis plain, He had no thought of including any Person or Nature of his own among the excepted: For whatever was not the Father, he says, was ignorant of that Day; now 'tis certain, that in *no Nature* was the Son the Father; and consequently where *None* but the Father knows, none who is *not* the Father, can be intended; and since our Lord was making an exception in the Case, he wou'd not have forgotten to except the Eternal *Word* too, if there had been such a Divine principle in himself, *equal* to the Father and distinct from him; for 'tis a known *Rule*, that an exception from a general Assertion, confirms it as to other instances not excepted.

Will they say, That by the Father is meant all Three Persons here? *Viz.* Father Son and Holy Ghost: What! can the Father as opposed to the Son, be put for the Father and the Son? What woful work will this make with Scripture, to suppose that what are *Opposed* to each other, do include each other, under the very Characters by which they are opposed? As well may they say that in the Baptismal Form; by the Father is meant, Father, Son, and Spirit, tho he be distinguished from the other two; and I shou'd despair of ever understanding the Scriptures above all Books that ever were written, at this Rate of Interpretation: No doubt therefore, but the Father as opposed to the Son, ex-

cludes all that is the Son, and then there cou'd be no Son of God that knew of that Day which only the Father knew of, and consequently no Son that is God *equal* to the Father.

3. Moreover, That Interpretation must needs be unjust, which if admitted, will make all, even the most plain Speech *uncertain*, and utterly insignificant: as this interpretation of Christ's words wou'd do: For as I ask the *Patrons* of this Opinion, in what words Jesus Christ cou'd in *Brief* have denied himself to be God most High, if he had a mind to do it, more plain and full than these? in which he says, he knew not all things as the Father did, nor cou'd do all things, &c. So I would fain have them shew me, what words of that Nature he cou'd have used, which the *same way* of interpretation, as they here use, will not *evade* and make insignificant. For had he said, or *Sworn* in plain words thus, *Viz.* *I tell you I am not the Supream God*; and none but my Father has that Glory. They wou'd upon the *same Reason* still have said, This was to be understood of him as *Man* only! So that no words professing himself *not* to be God, cou'd be a proof of it, if this way of interpretation be Allowed: So that I may safely say thus much, that the Blessed Jesus has declared himself *not* to be the Supream God, or equal to the Father, as plainly as words cou'd speak, or in brief, express: And that this Declaration made by him already is not to be evaded, any *other way*, than what will make it impossible his mind shou'd be understood by any words he cou'd have designedly used in the matter: Let any one try if this do not hold True; and sure it must be an absurd way of interpretation which leaves a Man no Opportunity or Power of speaking his Meaning *plainly*, so as to be understood.

4. Again, this way of interpretation, which the Advocates of the Opinion I oppose, are so much necessitated to, for upholding



their Cause, does plainly overthrow it again, and may be turn'd against themselves; for if it be just and true to deny of Christ absolutely what belongs to him in one Nature, because there is another Nature in which it belongs not to him; then, since to be the chief God belongs to him (according to our Adversaries) only in *one Nature*, and not in respect of the other, or humane Nature, it follows that it may as justly be said Jesus Christ is not God, nor to be *Worshiped* or *Trusted* as such; Nay, That he was not before the *Virgin Mary*, according to them and the like; and this without adding any limitation or restriction, any more than our Lord does in the place mentioned.

What wou'd they say to one who shou'd speak or preach so, *That Jesus is not God*, that he cannot do all things, nor is equal to the Father, &c. Wou'd they not conclude he was a Denyer of the Deity of Christ? else he wou'd never speak so unguarded: upon the *same* Account, when Jesus Christ himself says; that he cannot of *himself* do all things, nor knows all things, and makes no reserves in his words, we may conclude he also *denies* his being Supream God; *else*, if it be a just way of speaking in him, it cannot be unjust in us to imitate him, by denying him indefinitely, to be, what he in any one Nature is not, *i. e.* that he is *not God*, without adding more.

Nay, After this way of Speaking which they Attribute to Christ, a Man may be Taught to say his Creed *Backward*, and yet make a true profession of his Faith, by denying of Jesus Christ in absolute Expressions, what ever may be denied of one of his Natures; thus since the *Apostles Creed* takes Notice of nothing to be believed concerning Christ, but what belongs to his *Manhood* (which is very strange, if there were any Articles relating to his Divinity, which must needs be most important) one may venture to deny them all, with this

*secret unexpressed Reserve, Viz.* Meaning it of the Divine Nature (to which they belong not) So that one may say, I believe not that Jesus Christ was Conceived of the *Holy Ghost*, or *Born* of the *Virgin Mary*; I believe that he never was Crucified under *Pontius Pilate*, nor was Dead or Buried; that he never *Rose* nor *Ascended*, nor will *Return* visibly again; for his Divine Nature (which 'tis pretended he had) was not capable of these Things; and since they say, the Personality is Divine, here seems more warrant to be bolder in denying indefinitely of the person what belongs not to the Divine Nature, whose the *Personality* is, than in so denying, of the person what only belongs not to the humane Nature; as this Interpretation makes Christ to do.

5. Finally, it weighs something with me, in opposition to this way of interpretation, that the Evangelists never take any occasion (when they had so many) to subjoyn any *Caution* against taking Christ's words in their obvious Sense, when he says, *He did not know the Hour*, &c. and the like. If as we said, our Lord had no mind to reveal his Divinity (tho I see not still why he shou'd deny it thus) yet *sure* his Apostles who wrote so many Years after, whom it concerned to Reveal all important Truths most clearly, wou'd not fail to have set the Reader Right, by removing such obvious Objections as these are against the Supream Deity of Christ; and saying, he spake this only in respect of his *Manhood*, that he *knew not all things*, &c. But here is not one Caution given, as often we find there was about less Matters, *John 2. 21. Ch. 11. 13.* No doubt it was, because they wou'd have the thing understood as it fairly lies, not thinking of any such *secret Reserve* in Christ, of a *Divine Nature* in his Person, to be tacitly excepted, when he had denied such perfections of his Person indefinitely.

Thus it remains Good, that Jesus Christ disclaims infinite perfections, to belong to

him as to the Father; and therefore that he is not the same infinite God with him, if we can believe his own Words: But before I conclude this Argument, I shall endeavour to Answer what our Opposers offer on the *contrary* side: They say there is abundant Evidence from other Scriptures, that Jesus Christ has those perfections in him, which I have shewed in the forementioned places, he denies of himself; these they lay in *Ballance* to the other, and since both sides cannot be proved, it must be examined, which ought to yield? Particularly they say *Omniscience* is ascribed to Jesus Christ, even such as is peculiar to the Supreme God; and since this indeed is that infinite perfection which they seem to alledge the most plausible Testimonies for its belonging to him, therefore I chuse to single out this in particular: I think I have made good the *Negative* already from his own Mouth, that he did not know all things: Nor can any thing of equal Evidence and Force be produced for the Affirmative, as will appear upon considerate Examination.

The Instances usually alledged to prove the infinite *Omniscience* of Jesus Christ are either; 1. Such as speak of his knowing all things in General; or, 2. Of his knowing Mens Thoughts and Hearts in particular: To both which I Reply.

*First*, 'Tis Objected, that the Disciples ascribe to him the Knowledge of all things, as *John* 16. 30. *ch.* 21. 17. *Thou knowest all things: I Answer*, That as those Expressions are words of Admiration from the Disciples *not yet inspired*: So they are intended only to express a very great and comprehensive Knowledge far from infinite, *Divine Omniscience*, as appears.

1. By Christ's own words, he knew not what the Father knew, *Viz.* The time of the Day of Judgment.

In that it was common to ascribe all Knowledge to Men of extraordinary Wisdom, especially when any intended to

commend them highly, and were affected with wonder; for Admiration and Praise naturally inclines to run out into *Hyperboles*; thus the Woman of *Tekoa* under a surprising wonder of *David's* Sagacity cries out: *My Lord knows all things on Earth, and is as Wise as an Angel*, 2 Sam. 14. 20. and the Apostle in commendation of some Christians says, *They knew all things*, 1 John 2. 20. and 27. and yet 'tis plain such *Encomiums* must have their limitations; and indeed the Jews seem to have thought that their Prophets knew, in a manner, *all Things*, Thus *Luke* 7. 39. When a woman of ill Fame Anointed our Lord's Head; the *Pharisee* says of him, *If this Man were a Prophet, he would know what manner of Woman this is*: And when the woman of *Samaria* found that he told her of all her secret Acts that ever she did, she concludes thus, *Sir I perceive thou art a Prophet*, John 4. 19. 'Tis no wonder then if the Disciples speak thus of him, thou knowest all things, without esteeming him more than the greatest of Prophets.

3. 'Tis evident they never intended more, by attributing *all knowledge* to him, from their own words in one of the Texts mentioned, *John* 16. 30. Where the Disciples tell us, how much they inferred from his Great Knowledge (which they describe and extol, by saying, Thou knowest all things) not that he was God, but one sent of God, by this we believe that thou comest forth from God: Not that thou thy self art that God. So that by these large Expressions, they only intend to Attribute to him what a created Being is, by Divine Assistance, capable of; and therefore 'tis Violence to their words, to infer from them, that Jesus Christ is God, when themselves infer no such thing; who best knew their own meaning.

And yet if it were Granted that our Lord Jesus knows all things, *i. e.* which *actually* are; yet if he knows not all *Futurities* too, which himself Denies, he comes short of infinite.



infinite Omniscience. For ought I know, a finite Being may have a knowledg commensurate to this poor Earth, which is but *a dust of the Ballance*; and yet not know all God's secret Purposes, or the Seasons which the Father keeps in his own Hand, *Acts 1. 7.*

2. 'Tis Objected, That the knowledg of the Heart is ascribed to Christ, *John 2. 25. Mat. 9. 9.* But especially, *Rev. 2. 23.* and this they say is what belongs to God only, as *Solomon* judges, *1 Kin. 8. 39.* and God claims it as his eminent Glory, *Jer. 17. 10.* and yet *Jesus Christ* says, *I am he who searches the Heart*; therefore say they, surely he must be that God, *Who only knows the Hearts of all the Children of Men.* I take this to be the strongest instance that can be produced from the Sacred Text, for proving any infinite Divine Perfections to belong to the Lord *Jesus Christ*, and it shall be seriously considered.

In Answer hereto, I shall shew Two things. 1. In what Sense, the searching and knowing the Heart is made peculiar to God, and incommunicable to others, by those Texts. 2. That notwithstanding it be peculiar to him in some Sense, yet these Acts may in another Sense be justly Attributed to another, and perform'd by him who is not the Most High God.

1. As to the former, tho *Solomon* say, *Thou Lord only knowest the Hearts of all Men.* Yet what if I say, 'tis no wonder that *Solomon* shou'd not know of any other to whom that Excellency was Communicated, since this *Mystery* of the Unsearchable Riches and Fulness of Christ, and of God's being manifest in his Flesh, and his High Exaltation of him, was hidden in the Ages past, and only manifested in the times of the Gospel; for 'tis in these latter times that our Lord *Jesus* has obtained his great Authority and Dignity, for which he has Received answerable Abilities: Yet I add, such Expressions in Scripture, appropriating some perfections to God, do only im-

port that God has *no equal* herein, or that there is an *Eminent* Sense only in which such perfections are peculiar to God, and incommunicable to all others; tho still in a *Lower* Sense something of them may be Communicated by him to others; and this shall be seen, to be no forced Supposition, but according to the current strain of plain Scripture, in a multitude of instances. Thus 'tis said, *That God only is Wise*, *Rom. 16. 27. 1 Tim. 1. 17. So Ch. 6. 16. God only has Immortality.* So *Thou only art Holy*, *Rev. 15. 4.* and yet there are *Wise* and *Holy Men*, and immortal *Holy Angels* and *Spirits*; but the meaning of those appropriate Expressions is, that the Blessed God is *Wise*, and *Holy*, and *Immortal*, in a more *Excellent* way and higher Sense than all others, and in which Sense others cannot be so. So when 'tis said *God only knows the hearts of Men*, it must be interpreted the same way, *Viz.* That there is none can know the Heart as God does, so Universally, so immediately and independently. And yet 'tis no contradiction, to say that he enables another to do it, in great measure, under him. And as he wou'd Argue but very weakly who shou'd go about to prove an Angel to be God, from this that he is called *Holy* and *Wise*, &c. which are said to belong to God only: *Even* so in the same manner must they Argue who wou'd prove *Jesus Christ* to be the Supreme God, from his knowing Mens Hearts, because 'tis said to belong to God only; except they can shew that *Jesus Christ* knows in the same excellent independent manner and degree as his Father, and that he is no more beholden to him for Ability and Assistance than he is to his Son *Jesus Christ*. So I might Argue from *Isa. 46. 9.* That God only knows *Futurities*, and yet how often have the Prophets foretold them from him?

And 'tis not hard to suppose that as Holiness and Wisdom, so to know the thoughts and Hearts of Men, hath been Communicated

cate  
not  
phe  
of  
leat  
1 Co  
Sap  
vine  
Rev  
Chr  
is fo  
His  
how  
reve  
Chu  
that  
Anf  
gave  
that  
Hea  
and  
affir  
B  
the  
Ans  
ever  
own  
seach  
vela  
Affir  
of s  
pres  
Kno  
to i  
God  
to n  
and  
be ta  
to C  
in th  
so ca  
God  
Se  
tribu  
Jesus  
High  
some  
cated

cated to Prophets and Apostles; was there not something of this, if not in the Prophet *Elisha's* telling the secret Counsels of the Syrian King, *2 Kings* 6. 12. yet at least in the *Spirit of Discerning* mentioned *1 Cor.* 12. 10. and in the case of *Ananias* and *Saphyra*? *Acts* 5. I grant this was by Divine Assistance of the Spirit of God, and by Revelation: Neither is our Lord *Jesus Christ* ashamed to own that His Knowledge is sometimes owing to *Revelation from God His Father*, *Rev.* 1. 1. If any should ask, how *Jesus Christ* comes to know all that he reveals in those seven Epistles to the seven Churches, &c. The very first words of that Book of the Revelations may be an Answer, *It was the Revelation which God gave to Jesus Christ*, &c. No wonder then that he says, he knows their Works, their Hearts, and their approaching Judgments and Trials, when his own vast Abilities are assisted by God's Revelation.

But it will be said, that His *searching the Heart*, Imports it to be His own Act. Answer; So it may very well be; for whatever a Man knows, he knows it by his own Act; And why may not the *Mind* search, and yet be under the light of Revelation, and the Influence of Superior Assistance? But yet after all, these Words of *searching the Heart*, are only an Expression that denotes the *Accuracy* of His Knowledge, not the *Manner* of attaining to it, for taken properly, as applied to God, 'tis dishonourable to say, he is put to make a *search*, since all things are naked and open to His view. And if they must be taken *Strictly* and Properly, as applied to Christ, then they belong not to Him in the same Sense as they do to God, and so can be no Argument of His being that God, which leads me to shew:

Secondly, That there's no absurdity in attributing this Knowledge of the Heart to *Jesus Christ*, tho' He be not the Most High God. That he knows things with some limitation as to the Degree, and in

dependence on His Father, as to the *Manner*, appears by what has been said already: And therefore the knowledge of the Heart attributed to Him, must be such as is consistent with His Subordination to the Father's greater Knowledge.

'Tis pleaded, That 'tis not possible for a Finite Being to have such Universal knowledge of the hearts and ways of Men, as is ascribed to *Jesus Christ*, and which as *Head* and Ruler of the Church, and World, He ought to have, and therefore he is infinite God.

Answer, I am pretty sure, it can never be demonstrated, that it exceeds a Finite capacity to know the concerns of all on this Earth, when the enlarged understanding is assisted in the highest Manner by Divine Influence and Revelation. The reason is, because the *Object* is Finite, and I challenge any Man to shew me how it can be impossible for a Finite capacity to Comprehend a Finite Object, as this World is, and would be, tho' it were Ten thousand times greater than it is? I am Satisfy'd this can never be demonstrated to imply any contradiction in it; And that all such imaginations concerning it, Proceed Chiefly from too high a Conceit of Man, and too low apprehension of the infinite God; as if the distance between these two were so small, that there cou'd not be one made of a Capacity so much above Men, as to be Commensurate to them all, but presently he must be the most High God, as tho' that Supreme Being cou'd not produce one who shou'd be a Thousand times beyond all this Earth and its Inhabitants, and yet it be infinitely below Himself: Methinks, if the *Sun* was but an Intelligent Creature, and cou'd diffuse his Intellectual Influences as he do's his Natural; cou'd but see and understand with his Beams and secret Influences, 'Tis easy to imagine what a Penetrating and Comprehensive knowledge he might have, but we may Entertain much greater thoughts of the *Sun of Righteousness, Jesus Christ*.



And I conceive a strong argument to prove Jesus Christ as Man, capable of such deep and extensive Knowledge, may be drawn from the Offices of Dignity and Power conferred on Him by God. For God has *given to Him to be Head over all things*, Eph. 1. 22. *He has given or committed to Him all Judgment*, John 5. 22. And that as the *Son of Man*, v. 27. In short, His Kingly Office by which he Rules over all the World, and takes special care of all His Members, as it Necessarily supposes His knowledge of the whole Estate of His Church and every Member of it, as far as is necessary for the Discharge of that *Trust*; So I think it undeniably proves this large Knowledge to be Exercised by Him as *Man*, however he gains it;

For, since this Office and Power is given, it cannot *Terminate* in the Divine Nature; for who can *give* to God, any Dignity or Power, who has all *Originally* in His own Being? it must then be given to the *Man*, or humane Nature only: And if the Man Christ Jesus sustain this Office, and be invested with this Kingly Power, even with *all* Power in Heaven and Earth, then as *Man* we cannot deny him to be suitably qualified for it, with all requisite Abilities, lest we reproach God, as calling one to an Employment, who is not fitted for it, or *Himself* in assuming a trust which he is not able to discharge; besides, unless His humane Nature can execute this Power, it cannot be said to be given to it, for a Power which cannot be exerted, or is impossible to be executed, is not given nor Received, any more than a Commission, or Grant to a Stock or a Tree, to bear Rule, not over the other Trees (as in *Job's* Apologue) but over a Nation, or to Command an Army: 'Tis no Gift at all, if this were the case, that the *Man* Christ Jesus be utterly incapable of the Office and Government lodged in Him.

If it be said, That tho' the Office and delegated Authority be committed to the

humane, yet 'tis only executed by the Divine Nature in Christ. I *Answer*, 'Tis most unreasonable to suppose this *Trust* committed to the Man Christ, who must at last *deliver* it up, 1 Cor. 15. 24. and yet the Management of it belong only to another Being: How can he be Commended for being *Faithful, over the House of God, to Him who appointed or constituted Him*, Heb. 3. 2, 6. when 'tis not expected he shou'd execute His Office? I Grant indeed that His *Kingly Office* is executed by the assistance of God, as he exerts His Divine Power and Wisdom, through the humane Nature of Christ, and Communicates of them in *all fulness* to Him, in whom it dwells; But to say, that the Man Christ does not Exercise His Kingly Universal Power, but that His Divine Nature (supposing it) does solely and immediately execute the Office given to Him as *Man* or Mediator, (for to God can nothing be given) is in my Mind a most Gross absurdity; for 'tis to say, That God Officiates for Man, in Execution of a *Delegated*, or Subordinate Authority; or that he Acts under the Authority, and in the Name of a Creature, which is not meet to be said of the Supreme God. It remains therefore, That as Christ's Universal Kingdom and Headship, is by Gift from God (of which only the Man Christ is the Receiver) committed as a *Trust* to Him; So he certainly wants no ability to execute that *Trust* in the *Nature* entrusted with it; I say no ability, whether of Power or Knowledge, sufficient to render Him, a careful, vigorous, and every way most Effectual *Head* of His Body, and Ruler of the World; and to deny this, is to Rob Him of His greatest Glory.

Besides, What Benefit or Gift is it to the Man Christ, that the Divine Nature shou'd execute a Power which it *always* had, and cou'd Exercise without any Gift to Him? What Reward; or what Addition was this to Him?

Another

Another *Argument* may be drawn, from that Comfortable Ground of confidence in a *Christians* Address to God, which the Scripture lays down, *viz.* The Sympathizing Compassion of our Lord Jesus Christ, towards His distressed Servants, arising from His own sufferings when on Earth, *Heb. 4. 15, 16. Seeing we have not an High Priest, who cannot be touched with the feeling of our Infirmities, but was in all points Tempted as we are: Let us therefore come boldly to the Throne of Grace.* Christ's having been tryed with Sufferings, makes Him a more Compassionate earnest Advocate for us; and this is our Comfort.

Now 'tis certain, This Compassion arising from His own experience of trouble, can belong to none but His humane Nature; the Divine Nature is Compassionate, but not for this reason, because it was Tempted, or grieved with Misery: No, it was only the Man Christ suffered, and consequently feels a *Sympathy* from hence with His distressed Servants: And 'tis most certain, that if he Sympathize with them in their troubles, he must then know them in that Nature, which only has a fellow feeling of them, for none can Sympathize with the Miseries of others which he knows not of; So that they who deny Christ's humane Nature to be capable of the knowledge of all our Miseries, do in effect deny Him to be such a Compassionate Advocate as the Scripture represents Him, and Rob us of this Strong ground of Consolation and Hope in our approaches to God, which the *Apostle* wou'd have us to build on.

And this Doctrine has been so far from appearing, either impossible, or absurd to the reason of Mankind, that I might produce the consent of a very great Number of learned Men, even among them who oppose my other Opinions. The *Lutherans* allow the Man Christ a sort of universal Knowledge, as well as universal Presence which they Plead for. The School-Men,

both *Thomists* and *Scotists*, allow Him universal Knowledge, tho' they differ in their way of explaining it:

And there was a time in the *Sixth Century*, when in the Christian Church some were branded with *Heresie*, under the Name of *Agnoeta*, who held Christ was ignorant of any thing, which I conceive must have been in relation to His humane Nature; for those Persons owned Him to have a *Divine Nature*, and 'tis hard to imagine they could attribute Ignorance to that. But (waving that Matter which is disputed) it is enough for my purpose, *viz.* to prove what Sense the Christian Church then had of Christ's extensive Knowledge, as *Man*; that they who wrote against those *Hereticks*, do expressly deny any ignorance in Christ as *Man*; for this we may produce two famous *Patriarchs* of the Christian Church at that time, *viz.* *Eulogius* of *Alexandria*, and *Gregory* of *Rome*: Those *Hereticks* produc'd for their Opinion, Christ's Words, That he knew not the time of the last Judgment, as an instance of His ignorance: To this the *Former* Person says, that he was not ignorant of it, not as *Man*, and much less as *God*: The latter says, *In Natura quidem humanitatis novisse, sed non ex Natura humanitatis.* He knew it with the humane Nature, but that knowledge did not rise from the humanity; which is what I maintain as to the knowledge I attribute to him, but not extending it so far as to all *futurities*, which they did.

And I find not a few of the Modern *Reformed Divines*, (who when out of this Dispute) speak agreeably to this, and are far from thinking it Idolatry, to ascribe as much knowledge as I have done, to the *Man Christ*. Thus the Reverend Mr. *Baxter*, in his Notes on *Eph. 4. 16.* plainly intimates, that he conceives an *Angel* might be made capable of Ruling the *Universal Church* on Earth by Legislation, Judgment, and Execution: For having said  
thie



this Task was impossible to any Power but Divine; He corrects himself by adding, or *Angelical at least*; And sure the *Man* Christ's Ability, is far Superior to Angels; besides that he has them Ministering to Him, and giving Him notice of Matters if there be any Occasion; for he has Seven Principal Spirits, who are the *Eyes of the Lamb sent forth through all the Earth*, as the same Author interprets, *Rev. 5. 6.*

So the Author of a little Book, called the *Future State*, the same who wrote the *Good Samaritan*, a worthy Divine of the Church of England, says many things very Rational concerning the large extent of Christ's humane Knowledge; that probably, *He can as easily inspect the whole Globe of this Earth, and the Heavens that encompass it, as we can view a Globe of an Inch Diameter*, P. 46, 47. that he intercedes as *Man*, and can he intercede in a case which he knows not? So again, P. 150. The like says *Limborch* in his *Theol. Christ.* lib. 5. C. 18.

Let me add only the Testimony of Dr. *Thomas Goodwin*, who was never I suppose censur'd for an *Idolater* among *Dissenters*; And yet 'tis scarce possible that I should attribute greater knowledge to the *Man* Jesus Christ than he. See his *Select cases*, part 3d, where he says, *The humane understanding of Christ takes in all occurrences which concerns His Church. And that as he said all Power in Heaven and Earth is given me of my Father, so might he say all knowledge in Heaven and Earth is given me, that his Beams pierce into every corner, that he knows the Sore of every Heart, and concludes with these remarkable words, that as a Looking-Glass wrought in the form of a Globe, represents the Images of all that is in the Room: So the enlarged humane understanding of Christ, takes in all things in Heaven and Earth at once.* It seems these Men did not take it to be the Peculiar Perfection of the Divine Nature to know the *Hearts*; So as that no Creature could partake of it by Divine assistance and Revelation.

Indeed, as to the manner of knowing the heart; We cannot tell how the inhabitants of the other World have access to our minds or to each others, but without doubt, *Jesus Christ*, whose eyes are as a *Flame of Fire*, has more proper abilities for penetration, as well as more Revelation from God, and more Capacity, for receiving and treasuring it up, than all others. In short, 'tis evident Christ as *Man*, is the Great *Administrator* of Gods providential Kingdom, *John 5. 27.* As *Man*, he must Judge the whole World, *Acts 17. 31.* which implies vast and universal knowledge. Who then dares say, that the *Man* Christ Jesus, has not a Knowledge as large as this narrow Earth, or as the Sand by the Sea shore, without any *Hyperbole*? I think 'tis beyond all reasonable doubt, and as this Doctrine has appear'd Rational enough, and escaped all Censure, as far as I know, when delivered by others than the *Unitarians*: So I hope it must not be counted *Heretical* in them, for which others never Forfeited the Glorious Title of *Orthodox*.

Thus it appears, That all which is said of Christ's extensive Knowledge in Scripture, is far from proving Him to be the Supreme Infinite God, it may be Accounted for otherwise very fair; And the like may be also said with respect to other (which some call) *Divine* perfections attributed to Him, that they are no more truly infinite, as attributed to Him, than this of Knowledge, but that there are plain evidences of their being attributed to Him in a limited, and inferior Sense, in comparison of what they are, in the most Glorious God over all Gods; and therefore Men had need produce other sort of Arguments for the Supreme Deity of Christ, than from these Topicks.

Nor do I doubt but I could maintain my cause with equal advantage, upon the Head of *Divine worship*, which is another Topick, whence my opposers would infer the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ; it

were

were easy to shew, there is no Instance of supreme Divine Worship given ultimately to him in Scripture, but on the contrary, that all the Honour it assigns to him, is such as speaks him to be inferior to the Father, and dependent on him; since it is wholly grounded upon what God his Father has graciously bestowed on him: Thus he requires Baptism (if that be an act of immediate proper Worship) in his Name, because all power in Heaven and Earth was given to him. Thus we must honour the Son as (truly not as greatly as) we honour the Father, because the Father hath committed, or given, all Judgment to him, Joh. 5. 22, 23. Thus at the Name of Jesus must every Knee bow, and every Tongue confess him to be Lord; because as a reward of his Obedience the Father hath given him a Name above every Name: And 'tis added, that all this Homage is ultimately to the Glory of the Father. Worship which is thus grounded upon derived and borrowed Excellency, is not supremely Divine, and cannot be offered to the Infinite Self-originate, Independent Deity, without a great Affront, because 'tis not the most excellent, Mal. 1. 14. to praise an independent God, for Honour and Power granted to him by another, supposes a Falshood, and mingles Reproaches with Praise.

So that however there may be the same common external Acts, or Words (such as bowing the Knee, and saying Glory and Praise, &c.) used to God and the Mediator; as also in some Instances, they are given in common to ordinary Men, yet the Mind of a Rational Worshipper, will make a Distinction in his inward Intention, as no doubt but those devout Jews did, who in the same act, bowed their Heads, and worshipped both God and the King, 1 Chron. 29. 10. but I shall not pursue this any farther at present.

Moreover, I judg, that to assert Jesus Christ to be the supreme God, subverts the Gospel Doctrine of his Mediation; for if

I must have one who is *supreme God, and Man*, for my Mediator with God; then when I address to Jesus Christ as the supreme God, where is the *God-man* that must be my Mediator with him? To say he mediates with himself, is the same as to say, that I must go to him without a Mediator, and turns the whole Business of Mediation into a *Metaphor*, contrary to the common Sense of things, as well as against the Scripture; and I would gladly know what is the notion of going to God without a Mediator, if this be all, that he mediates with himself? Who ever doubted the exercise of his own *Wisdom or Mercy*, that these do in a sort plead in him? But sure the Scriptures speak of a Mediator without him, when they set forth Jesus Christ as such; and who is this *Mediator*, when we go to Jesus Christ as the *ultimate Object*? If it be said, his *Human Nature* only acts in this Mediation, tho as united to the *Divine*; I answer, That as this is still to make Christ Mediator with himself, so the *Humane Nature* is not *God-man*; and if the *Man*, or *Humane Nature alone*, be capable of doing the part of a Mediator, then 'tis not necessary that Jesus Christ should be more than a *Man* inhabited by, and related to God, in order to that Office: Nor may it be said, that the union to the *Divine Nature*, gives an *infinite efficacy* to those Acts, of which the *Humane* only is the principle; for unless by that union, the *Humane Nature* was turn'd into an Infinite or Divine Nature, its acts can no more be reckoned properly and *intrinsically* Infinite in this case, than his *Body* or *Humane Understanding* are infinite, because so united to an Infinite Nature.

But what fully demonstrates, that the *Humane Nature* of Christ can never be an *effectual* Mediator, (according to them) no, not tho it were personally united to the *Divine*, is this, *viz.* That they deny this *Humane Nature* so united, to have the knowledg of the secret, mental Prayers, the



inward Desires and Distresses of all Christians, or to know any ones *Heart*: And how then can he be a compassionate Intercessor in cases that he knows nothing of? Or how can he have a *fellow-feeling* of their Sufferings, which he knows not that they feel at all? What comfort is there in this account of Christ's Mediation? The Divine Nature is præcluded from it, because they direct us to seek to that as the *ultimate Object* thro a Mediator; and the Humane Nature, they say, may know nothing of our case, nor knows *our Hearts* whether we Worship sincerely, or Repent sincerely, or hypocritically only; and so knows not how to represent, or recommend to God: What a case now do these Men bring us into? There is no *Mediator* left, to interpose with the Supreme God, so that we must deal with him *immediately* and alone, which they will own is far from the Gospel Doctrine or Method. *This* is the *Ld. Jesus* turn'd out of his *Office*, on a pretence of giving him higher honour. So that upon the whole, as far as I see, we had even as good be content with the *Apostle's* fair and plain account of this matter; if its being so very *intelligible*, may not be an unpardonable Objection against it, *viz.* That *there is but one God, and one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. Never let us fear, but *Paul* knew how to describe the *Mediator*, without leaving out the better half of him, or the Principal Nature: Our Mediator, according to him, was only a *Man*; who also is by Office a *God*, or Ruler over all; made so by him who *puts all things* under him.

And indeed as there are two principal distinguishing Doctrines of Christianity, relating to the *Unity* of the Supreme God, and the *one Mediator* with him; so the *Trinitarians* have lost them both among their several *Parties*. For as they are divided into two principal *Parties* (besides several Sub-divisions) both among Confor-

mists and *Dissenters*, one part holding *three* real Persons, or *infinite Beings*, the other but *one* (for they are not yet agreed whether they worship *three* infinite supreme Beings or but *One*) so between them both, these *two great Doctrines* are subverted, the *Realists* leave room for a *Mediator in the Godhead*, but they destroy the *Unity of God*, who is *one* Infinite Being; on the other hand, they who hold true to the *Divine Unity*, or one infinite Being under *three Modes*, or Properties, or Relations, do by plain consequence leave no place for such a *Mediator* as they require, *viz.* One who is an *infinite God*, to be Mediator with the infinite God; when there is no other *infinite Being* but his own, and he cannot be thought to intercede with *himself* neither. So that to keep the Gospel Faith whole and *undefiled*, 'tis necessary that we avoid both these Rocks, by believing *God* and his *Christ* to be Two Beings, that so there may be room for One to Mediate with the Other: And that these Two are not two equal or supreme Beings, but one *subordinate* to the other, that so we may preserve the *Unity* of the supreme God.

Let us then bethink our selves seriously, not what the Church in latter Days has thought of Jesus Christ, but what his own *Apostles*, when inspired, have thought of him: Methinks none was more likely, or ever had a fairer Occasion to represent his Lord in the height of his *Glory*, than the *Apostle Peter*, in the Day of *Pentecost*. That Day of Triumph, with the newly and visible inspired *Apostles*: Hear how magnificently he describes his glorious Lord Jesus before his Murtherers, *Acts 2. 22.* *Ye men of Israel hear these words, Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by Miracles, Wonders and Signs, which God did by him in the midst of you.* Again 36. *Let all the House of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have Crucified, both Lord and Christ.* Now 'tis observable, the *Apostle*

was aiming at such a Description of Jesus Christ, as might strike the Hearts of his Murtheers with the greatest horror of their Crime, v. 23. and therefore cou'd never omit the most *emphatical* Branch of his Description, viz. His *Infinite Deity*, if he had really been such; What a terrifying Argument had that been to beget Conviction in his Persecutors beyond all the rest, to tell them they had shed the Blood of the *Infinite God himself*? 'Tis certainly all flat and low, that Peter says in comparison of this, viz. *That he was but a Man approv'd of God*. Did he not understand, or would he betray his Cause by such an Omisision? And yet he only represents Christ as a God by *Inhabitation* and *Exaltation*. When he was far from being daunted with any fear to own Christ fully; nay, if this *Deity* of Christ were a fundamental Article of *Christian Faith*, how comes it to pass, that when poor convinced Souls, in anguish for their Crimes, seek Direction how to be saved from them, v. 37. the Apostle shou'd not acquaint them with *this* Article, but directs them to believe in *this Jesus*, such as he had described him? Did he direct wounded Souls to an *insufficient* Saviour, without telling 'em he was the infinite God? Yet they are baptiz'd and added to the Church, and numbred among such as shall be saved: How can this be, if the supreme *Godhead* of Christ be a fundamental Article of the Christian Faith? So *Acts* 10. 38. *God was with him*. This was all.

To conclude, God and Christ (or one appointed) are two *Disparates*, or different Things, as much as Christ's *Body* and *Bread* are, and therefore cannot be predicated one of the other, in a proper sense, or without a figure, as all our Writers against the *Romish* Transubstantiation, argue, and is of equal force in the present case. To be anointed, imports, to be raised by Authority and Honour conferr'd; 'tis in effect to say, the Person is a Creature, or inferior Being; and therefore to say that

properly Christ is most High God, is to say the Inferior is Supreme, and the Man is God; which cannot be, only by a Figure, as the Bread is Christ's Body, viz. by relation, &c. And truly if the Business can be salved here, by making a personal Union between God and Christ, I see not why the Papists may not set up such another Union between Christ's Body and the Bread in the Eucharist, and then they may stoutly defend that 'tis the Body of Christ properly. But indeed nothing is more obvious than the unsteadiness of many Protestant Writers, when they write against the Papists and the Unitarians: How do they go backwards and forwards? And when they have triumphantly and fully beaten off the vain Assaults and Objections of the Papists, they take up their baffled Arguments, and urge them the same way (as others did against them) against the Unitarians; and what they have maintained against the former, as good Argument, notwithstanding Romish Evasions; these Arguments they oppose, when the Unitarians turn them against themselves, in the point of the Trinity, and they betake themselves to like Shifts and Evasions. Thus let the Papists object to them the Novelty of the Protestant Religion, and ask them where was their Religion and Church before Luther? They think it a weak Cavil, and can tell 'em their Religion was in the Bible, and their Church among the Primitive Christians, however it lay hid in the time of common Apostacy; and yet to the Unitarian they can make the same Objection, where has any Christian Church for so many Ages held that Christ was not God? Against the Papist they will prove that the Fathers did not hold the Elements to be Christ's real Body and Blood, because they oft call them the Images thereof: But let the Unitarian argue that Christ is not the supreme God, because the Scripture styles him the Image of God, and therefore



fore not the God whose Image only he is; then, the thing it self and its Image must be the same thing: *Against* the Papists they can prove S. Peter was inferior to the Church, and the rest of the Apostles, (tho' not singly to each) because he was sent up and down by them. This *Baronius* takes hold of, and tells them, by the same reason they must grant the *Arians* Argument to be good, viz. That the Father is greater than the Son, because the Son is sent by him: But let an *Unitarian* argue thus, and then tho' the Father sends, and the Son be sent by him, yet they shall both be equal, and this shall make no difference: *Against* the Papists they will boast, that they don't hoodwink the People in Ignorance; but bid them inquire and examine, and the more the better, while 'tis ground of Suspicion, that the Papists cheat Men, by their keeping them from the Light; but now, having to do with the *Unitarians*, they tack about, and bid beware of Reading and Disputing; they are for an *implicit Faith*, without examining into deep Mysteries; they bid us believe, not pry into them; tho' we only desire to examine whether the *Scriptures* do reveal any such Mysteries at all; the rest we will believe, if we could see that, and desire no other liberty in interpreting Scripture, than they take so justly, in interpreting Christ's words, *This is my Body*. Upon Protestant Principles the *Unitarians* think they can stand their ground, and defend themselves in these Matters, as easily as the *Protestants* can against the Papists.

As to Primitive Antiquity, so many *Inquirers* both among the *Romish* and *Reformed* Writers, have given their impartial Testimony, that it runs for *Arius's* *Doctrine*, and have made such poor Apologies for those *Fathers*, as tho' they knew not, or were not careful of their fundamental Articles of Faith, till they came to be bandied about in General Councils, that I think it not needful to say more here,

only one thing I wou'd suggest; That allowing the Primitive Writers to speak in different places with great, at least seeming Discord (which any ingenious Man must grant) sometimes plainly declaring Jesus Christ inferior to, and the *Servant* of the Father, before his Incarnation; at other times giving him high Titles, as of one equal with God; yet 'tis far more reasonable to suppose the higher Expressions should be expounded according to the other, than the contrary; because in discoursing of, and pleading for a beloved admired Object, as the Lord Jesus deserves to be, 'tis very easy and natural to run out into strains of Eloquence, and lofty flights of Praise, which must be interpreted not with strict Rigour, but with great Abate-ments; as is to be observ'd in some of their high *Encomiums* on the venerable Mystery of the Eucharist, as tho' with the Papists, they took the Elements for Christ's real Body, which yet they evidently deny. But on the contrary, no Men are wont ever to speak *diminutively* on such occasions; they could not have a thought to lessen their Master's Glory; and therefore if they ever represent him as not the supreme God, nor equal to him, we have all reason to think, they then spake only the Words of Truth and Soberness, what the exact Matter required.

For my own part, as I write this under the serious Impressions of those great Relations in which the Blessed Jesus stands to me, whom I credit as my great Teacher; whom I desire to admire and love as my gracious endeared Benefactor, beyond Father or Mother, or Friends, &c. Whom I reverence as my Lord and Ruler, and solemnly expect, as my Final Glorious Judge, who is to come in his own, and in his Fathers Glory, Luk. 9. 26. And in the mean time deal with God thro' him, as my only Mediator and Intercessor: So I earnestly profess, that 'tis not without grievous and bitter Resentments, that I should

shou'd be employ'd in Writing Things, which by so many well-meaning Christians will be *mis-interpreted*, to be derogatory to the Honour of this great Redeemer; but I know he loves nothing but Truth in his Cause, and will never be offended, I hope, with any who stand by his own Words, *viz.* The Father is greater than I, Joh. 14. 28. I think it a dangerous thing to say God is not greater than he, or is not the Head of Christ; for, whom will ye equal to me, saith the Holy One? Isa. 40. 25. I am perswaded 'tis Truth I plead for, and that supports me.

However I wish they who are Adversaries to my Perswasion, wou'd learn at least the Modesty of one of the earliest Writers for Christianity since the Apostles, that we have, I mean Justin Martyr, who disputing with a Jew, and pleading for the Honour of Jesus Christ, whom he calls a God by the Will of the Father, and one who ministered to his Will, before his Incarnation: This Person attempts to shew, that Jesus Christ did *præexist* of old, as a God, (in his sense) and was born afterwards of a Virgin; but because as he says, there were some who confessed him to be Christ, and yet denied those Points of his *Præexistence* and his miraculous Birth of a Virgin, that Father calmly says to his Adversary, *If I shall not demonstrate these things, that he did præexist, &c. and was born of a Virgin; yet still, the Cause is not lost, as to his being the Christ of God; if I do not prove that he did Præexist, &c. It is just to say that I am mistaken in this Thing only, and not to deny that he is the Christ; for whosoever he be, that is every way demonstrated, that he is the Christ.* And as for those Christians who denied the abovesaid things, and held him to be only a Man, born in the ordinary way, he only says of them; *to whom I accord not.* He does not damn them who differed from him, nor will say the Christian Religion is subverted, and Christ but an Imposter, and a Broken

Reed to trust on, if he be not the very supreme God, (the ranting *Dialect* of our profane Age) no, but still he was sure he is the true Christ, whatever else he might be mistaken in: 'Tis desperate wickedness in Men to hazard the Reputation of the Truth and Holiness of the blessed Jesus, upon a difficult and disputable Opinion; to dare to say, That if they are mistaken in their Opinion (which I verily believe) then Jesus Christ is a Liar and Deceiver, a Mock Saviour, and the like: What is this but to expose him to the Scorn of Infidels?

So that I see, with sorrow, that to this very Day, even among professed Christians themselves, Christ Crucified is to some a Stumbling block, and to others Foolishness: If he be not as Good and Great, as the God who appointed him for a Saviour, tho he be allowed to be a Man approved of God, by Signs and mighty Wonders which God did by him; and by whom God made the Worlds, as the Instrument; tho he be granted to be One in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead, Joh. 14. 10. so as it never dwelt before in Prophets or any other; tho He be One with the Father, by Unity of Consent and Will, as Calvin interprets Joh. 10. 30. One in testimony with the Father and Spirit, as Beza and many others understand that in 1 John 5. 7. Tho he be the most lively visible image of God that the World ever saw, so that he who sees him, does in great measure see the Father, as in a bright Mirrour, Joh. 14. 10. Tho he be owned and served, as one far above Angels, and Archangels; and over all Powers in Heaven and Earth, a God or Ruler: The great Administrator of God's Kingdom, both on Earth, and in the invisible Hades, as having the Keys, or Ministerial Power of Death and Hell, Rev. 1. 18. Yet after all this, if he be not the very supreme God himself; nay to compleat the Absurdity, if he be not the same very



God, whose Son and Image he is; He shall be no Mediator for them; they do *ex Hypothesi*; or on this Supposition, openly disown him for their Saviour and Confidence; they are ashamed to trust in him, and seem rather to Deride and Reproach him, as *Insufficient* and *Contemptible*, than to Believe on him. These things are to me a very grievous Offence, who think it a great pity, that so excellent a Constitution as the Gospel is, so *amiable* to contemplate, so proper to entertain our thankful Admiration, for the *Grace and Wisdom* it contains, shou'd either be lost in the clouds of an *affected Obscurity*, or exposed to the derision of ungodly Scoffers.

'Tis yet a further grief to think what a fatal stop is hereby put to the Progress of the Gospel, whose Rejection by *Jews, Mahometans and Pagans*, is undeniably occasioned by the *common Doctrine* of the Incarnation of God; one may read in *Le Comptre's History of China*, how the Heathens derided the Christians Doctrine of a *Mortal God*; and upon that account look'd upon Christianity as *fabulous*, as their own Religion: And Doctor *Causabon*, in his *Book of Credulity and Incredulity*, p. 118. says he could prove by many Instances out of

History, that this *Doctrine* has kept more People from embracing the *Christian Faith*, than any other thing he knew of. Now tho I grant, that if it be the certain Truth of God, this must be no argument against receiving it; yet surely it shou'd make Men very cautious and impartial in their Inquiry about it, lest they bring on themselves the *Wo* denounced against them, by whom Offences (*that is*, *Stumbling blocks* in the way of the Gospel) do come.

In the mean time, in midst of these Troubles, 'tis a great and sweet Refreshment to wait and hope for a Remove to the *Mount Moriah*, the Land of *Vision* above, where all these Shades of the melancholly Night shall vanish away, and an eternal Day of clear Light and Peace shall shine on them who love our Lord Jesus in sincerity, in whose glorious Dignity I rejoice; nay, I desire to boast and Glory in this Exalted, Enthroned Redeemer; for worthy is the Lamb to receive Glory, and Honour and Blessing and Power, *Amen*; So be it!

Now to Him who loved us, and washed us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made us Kings and Priests to God, even the Father, to Him be Glory and Dominion for ever.

But this I confess unto thee, that after the way, which they call Heresy, so Worship I the God of my Fathers, believing all things which are written in the Law and the Prophets, Acts 24. 14.



FINIS.

## Advertisement.

**T**HE usual way of proving the Three Persons to be the One most High God, is, not by shewing the Son and Holy Spirit to be Unoriginate, Independent, absolutely Supreme, &c. as the Father is, and the True God must needs be ; but by catching at the Equivocal Term or Word God. And thus they argue :

1. That each of the Three Persons is call'd God (this is granted of Two, but for the Third, better Proof is desired than Acts 5. 3, 4.)

2. That there is but One God, (which in the most perfect and high sense is granted, but in another very common sense of the Term, there are Gods many, according to St. Paul.)

3. That therefore these Three are that same One God ; which will not be a good Consequence, unless the Three be call'd God in the same high and exalted sense in which there is but One God alone, i. e. One Independent and absolutely Supreme Being. Else one Person may be God, and another be God, and yet not the same God ; altho there be, in the noblest sense of that word, but one God. In short, since there is a sense in which there are Gods many, and a sense of the word God, in which God is but One ; the question will be, whether in that sense in which God is said to be but One,



any but the Father be said in Scripture to be God, 1 Cor. 8. 6. tho in some sense the Son may be call'd so too.

So for the Term Lord, there is a sense in which there is but One Lord; Mark 12. 29. Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord. And yet the Father and Christ are said presently to be two Lords, Ver. 36. For the Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou at my Right Hand. Now if the God of Israel be but one single Lord, and the Father and Son make two Lords, or a Lord and a Lord; quære, Whether shall we say, that these Two Lords be both of 'em that True God of Israel, who, as Christ says, is but One Lord; or that only One of these Two Lords is the Lord God of Israel, since he was but One Lord, and not Two Lords: Or shall we say, that a Lord speaking, and a Lord spoken to, are not Two Lords, but One Lord—after the Athanasian Creed?



A sober Expostulation with the Gentlemen  
and Citizens of Mr. *Emlin's* Juries in  
DUBLIN, concerning their *Billa Vera*  
and Verdict, June 14, 1703.

**T**HEY are deservedly reckon'd among the great Privileges of *English-men*, and such wherein their Freedom does mainly consist, viz.

1<sup>st</sup>. That they are subject to no Laws, but what are enacted by their own Consent, by Representatives of their own choice in Parliament: And 2<sup>dly</sup>, That the Execution of those Laws is for the most part by sworn Men of the Neighbourhood. That is, a Man can't be brought into Judgment, or judicially charg'd with any Crime which makes him liable to Punishment; but first a Grand Jury of twenty three, or at least twelve of those substantial Men, must upon their Oaths certify, that upon their own Knowledge, or the Evidence of other legal Witnesses, he appears to them to be guilty of such or such a Crime. Hereupon he is call'd to answer for himself before another Jury of twelve good and honest Men of his Neighbourhood, who are oblig'd by solemn Oath, and all other Ties of Humanity and Interest, to judge him as themselves would be judg'd. The Judges are of Council for the King or Queen and the Prisoner, to see that nothing be made a Crime, which is not indeed a Crime according to Law; and the Jury are Judges whether the Person indicted be guilty of the Fact which the Law pronounces a Crime. It's not enough in many cases to make one guilty, that he has done such a Fact or Deed, but it must also be prov'd that he did do that Fact in such a manner, and with such Circumstances as the Law pronounces criminal. Therefore the Indictments mention those Circumstances and that Manner: as for example, a Man is indicted, that having not the Fear of God before his Eyes, he did feloniously, and of fore-thought Malice, give a Man such and such Wounds, whereby he took away his Life; if it be prov'd to the Jury that the indicted Person did give such and such Wounds, yet if it be not also prov'd that he did so of fore-thought Malice, the Jury can't find him guilty of the Murder charg'd upon him. So if it be prov'd that a Man spoke such and such Words, that might in some Constructions tend to the Reprach or Scandal of another Person; yet if it be not prov'd that he spoke those Words with an intent to reprobach and scandalize that Person, he shall not be found guilty. For it may be that he did understand those Words in a good sense, that has no Scandal or Reprach in it, in his Mind and Judgment: As if a Man should say, that *St. Paul* was a *Knave of F.C.* understanding that Word (*Knave*) as *Tyndal* does in his Translation, and not in the modern sense of that Word. When the Lord *Shaftsbury*

A

fued



sued the Lord Digby for maliciously speaking such and such Words, he prov'd the Malice as well as the Words.

These things premis'd, give me leave, you Gentlemen of both the Juries, to expostulate with you concerning the finding the Bill of Blasphemy and Malice against *Tho. Emlyn* Gent. and your Verdicts thereupon; for which the Judges pass'd a Sentence of 1000 *l.* Fine, and Imprisonment for a year and a day, and then to give Security for his good Behaviour during Life.

The Indictment upon which you judg'd him guilty runs thus (as I am inform'd) when turn'd into *English*: That *T. E.* not having the Fear of God before his Eyes, ——— did write and cause to be printed a certain infamous and scandalous Libel, intituled, *An humble Enquiry* ——— in which Libel the said *T. E.* hath impiously, blasphemously, falsely, and maliciously asserted, affirmed, and declared. that Jesus Christ our Saviour and Redeemer is not God the Son, nor is equal to God the Father, and that Jesus Christ is not God the Son in the supreme Essence with the Father, (meaning) God the Father.

Now you Gentlemen being of the Neighbourhood or Vicinage, are suppos'd to know Mr. *E.*'s Character, his manner of Life and Conversation; he having liv'd among you twelve years in a publick Station of Elder, Presbyter, or at least Preacher to a Congregation of Presbyterians in *Dublin*. Did you know, or had you heard of him, that he had not behav'd himself as became him, either in his publick Performances or private Conversation? Was he not accounted by those that knew him best, a pious Man himself, and a Promoter of Piety in others? Did he not study the Holy Scriptures as the Rule of his Faith and Manners, as all Protestants hold; and diligently exhort others to do the same? Did he not study to find the true sense of Scripture (which only is Scripture) and to teach it to others? In brief, did he give any occasion to the most critical Observer

of him, to judg him a Hypocrite, a Dissembler, or ill-minded Man? Has he not by his ingenuous Declaration of his Mind in private Conversation, and afterward in his Writings (supposing 'em his) expos'd himself to all that Trouble, Obloquy, and Suffering which he now lies under? Might he not have avoided these, and continued in Credit, and in that profitable Station wherein he was, had he not thought himself oblig'd in Conscience to promote those Doctrines, which he conceiv'd to be much for the Honour of God and Christ, and more suitable to Holy Scripture than what is commonly taught? And if Mr. *E.* did not give you, or any one, just cause of suspecting him to be a bad Man, how came ye to judg him one of the worst of Men?

To be a Drunkard, a common Swearer, a Whoremonger, to be unjust, to deceive Men for their hurt and one's own gain, to be a false Witness, to be an Extortioner and to oppress; these are but Peccadillo's, small Faults in comparison of blaspheming God Almighty, the Fountain of all Goodness, the Father of Mercies, in whom we live and move and have our Being, who so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting Life: or to blaspheme Jesus Christ our Lord, who came to save us from our Sins, and redeem us to God, in whom we have Redemption thro his Blood, even the Forgiveness of Sins: to blaspheme either the Father or the Son, and to have malice against them, are so heinous and enormous Crimes, that we want Words to set forth the Horridness and Malignity of them. Yet you have upon your Oaths (which is the strongest and utmost Obligation that any Man can be under, to give a righteous Judgment concerning his Neighbour) judg'd Mr. *E.* to have impiously, blasphemously, falsely, and maliciously asserted, affirmed, and declared Jesus Christ our Saviour and Redeemer, *not to be God the Son, nor to be equal*

equal to God the Father ; and that Jesus Christ is not God the Son in the Supreme Essence with the Father, (meaning) God the Father.

To justify your Verdict upon this Indictment, it was necessary you should know, and be thoroughly persuaded in the fear of God, 1. That these Assertions and Affirmations are not only false, but impious ; and not only false and impious, but also blasphemous and malicious in their own Nature and Import, i. e. in the common Acceptation of *English* Christians. 2. That Mr. E. did so assert and affirm them. It's not enough to prove these Propositions to be false, because they may be false, and yet not impious ; for there are many different Opinions about these Points among the learned Divines of the Church as well as Dissenters ; and yet it were uncharitable to judg those that are mistaken to be guilty of Impiety : and it's manifest from the Clemency of the Government, that it does not censure them as such, that some may judg to be erroneous. The Bishops disagree among themselves, as appears from their Writings, and yet they are not accus'd of Impiety on either side ; nor are the Deans, and other Dignitaries and Doctors, charg'd with Impiety, tho they differ from their Bishops, and from one another. Some indeed have declar'd certain Propositions false, impious, and heretical, as the *Oxford* Decree doth some in one Mr. Bingham's Sermon, which are also to be met with in Dr. Sherlock's Book ; but they did not charge either the former or the latter with having falsly, impiously, and heretically taught, preach'd, or print-ed those false, impious, and heretical Doctrines. They did not cause either of them to be apprehended by a Warrant from the Lord Chief Justice, and bind them over to answer that Charge at the *Kings-Bench* Bar ; much less prefer an Indictment of Impiety and Heresy or Blasphemy against 'em, or either of 'em. So far from that, Mr. Bingham went into the Country to a good Living (if I

mistake not) however I'm sure Dr. Sherlock enjoys to this day his Deanery of *St. Paul's*, one of the best, or the best in England for Revenue, if not also for Dignity. Nay, Dr. Sherlock was so far from renouncing those false, impious, and heretical Propositions, that he presently writes a Book in defence of them, under the Title of *A modest Examination of the Authority and Reasons of the late Decree of the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, &c.* And what were those impious Assertions? even these, viz. [There are three infinite distinct Minds and Substances in the Trinity] Item [That the three Persons in the Trinity are three distinct infinite Minds or Spirits, and three individual Substances.] 'Tis in respect to these Propositions, that Dr. South wrote a Book against Dr. Sherlock with this Title, *Tritheism charg'd upon Dr. Sherlock's Notion of the Holy Trinity*. And one would think, that to hold and assert that there are three Gods, is not a little impious and heretical ; since Unity is the prime Attribute and Perfection of the Deity, most plainly asserted by Reason and Scripture, and profess'd as the most fundamental Article, after the Being of God, of Christian Religion, yea of the *Jewish* and *Mahometan*.

Thus, Gentlemen, you see there is a great deal of difference between asserting those Doctrines that are judg'd by many learned Men to be impious and heretical ; and the asserting them impiously and heretically. For as our Blessed Saviour says, My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me ; if any Man will do his Will, he shall know of the Doctrine ; if a Man be a known Doer of the Will of God, and a Studier of the Holy Scriptures, that he may know that Will, and do it himself, and teach others so ; if such a Person err in the understanding of the Holy Scriptures in matters of very abstruse Speculation, one can't without great Uncharitableness judg that he holds these false Doctrines impiously, heretically, blasphemously and maliciously.



But let us now consider those Assertions of Mr. E. charg'd in the Indictment, and judg'd by you to be false, impious, blasphemous, and malicious. As 1<sup>st</sup>, 'I see no reason there will be to oppose those Unitarians who think him (Jesus Christ) to be a sufficient Saviour and Prince, tho he be not the only Supreme God; nor can any with Reason attempt to prove him to be such from his Works and Office, as King of his Church; since 'tis implied that as such he must do homage to God the Father, in *delivering up his Kingdom to him*; and this very Expression to God the Father, makes it plain that there is no God the Son, in the same sense, or in the same Supreme Essence with the Father. Now to give a right Judgment concerning the Truth or Falshood of this Clause, it was necessary for you to consider it as an Inference from such and such Scripture Premises, from whence it is drawn. For if it be rightly infer'd, it must be true; if it is not rightly infer'd, then Mr. E. err'd. If so, then it was to be consider'd by you, what kind of Error it was; whether such an Error as a sober conscientious Man (who holds the Holy Scripture to be the Rule of his Faith and Practice) could fall into without Malice, and a blasphemous Intention against Jesus Christ; or if it be Mr. E's simple mistake from the Weakness of human Understanding, or other Temptations, to which the best of Men are obnoxious. If this latter was the case, then to judg him blasphemous, was most unjust and uncharitable; and whether you had or could have any clear Evidence for it, I appeal to your own Consciences. But 2<sup>dly</sup>, may not Mr. E. be understood to mean that *there is no God the Son in the same sense, or in the same Supreme Essence with the Father*? that is, that he is not the second of those three infinite Minds or Spirits, that make up the three Persons in the Holy Trinity; which Doctrine the Oxford Decree has determin'd to be false, impious, and heretical. Shall he be blasphemous in denying that which they

say is impious to affirm?

That which I have said of this Clause of the Indictment, may also be said of those other two Clauses; which are both Inferences from Scripture Premises, which he had laid down and argued before. And indeed it's so far from being blasphemous to Jesus Christ, to deny him to be equal to the Father in the Supreme Essence, that the generality of eminent Divines, both antient and modern, assert that the Father is the *Principle, Cause, and Fountain* of the Son and Spirit, whence they have their Essence and Divinity; and in that respect grant that the Son and Holy Spirit are not equal to the Father. But let that nicest of Controversies be as it will, I do not desire you should take any thing upon my word; that which I demand of you is, whether you could in *Truth, in Judgment, and in Righteousness*, swear that these Assertions, whercof Mr. E. was by you found guilty, were blasphemous, *i.e.* reproachful and disgraceful to our Lord Jesus Christ. As for the term *maliciously* (us'd in the Indictment) I am apt to think so well of you, tho altogether unknown to me, that I am persuaded, that not one Man of you, (even supposing those Clauses to be false and blasphemous) can seriously affirm, much less swear, that Mr. E. writ or publish'd them blasphemously, *i.e.* with an intention of reproaching his Saviour, or at least believing they were reproachful to him, much less maliciously and out of ill will toward him: That he not only knew that these Assertions were reproachful; but that he knew also that he did reproach him in so asserting; as a Man speaks evil of his Neighbour, tho he know it is false, and that he ought not to speak it. I doubt not but you are every one well acquainted with the Holy Scriptures; and there you find that Blasphemy under the *Mosaical Law* was so great and horrid a Crime, that it was to be punish'd with Death; but what was that Blasphemy? It's explain'd by cursing; *The Israelitish Woman's Son blasphemed the Name.*

*Name of the Lord, and cursed*: he not only spoke reproachfully of God, and intended to reproach or speak evil of him, but cursed him, as you may see *Lev. 24. 11, 14, 15.* But the Apostle Paul before his Conversion not only blasphemed Christ himself, but forced others to blaspheme him; forcing them by Violence to speak evil of Christ, to renounce him, and curse him as a false Prophet or Impostor. *Saul* knew it was evil and highly evil, what he said himself of Christ, and what he would force others to say; but he was mistaken in the Honour and Dignity of Christ, and he did it ignorantly in Unbelief. But what has Mr. E. done or said like to this? you ought to have read the Papers out of which that Blasphemy, charg'd in the Indictment, was drawn. I have read Mr. E's Case, &c. and there he says, he conceiv'd it more for the Honour of Jesus Christ to suppose the complete Deity in its full Conception, to be united to, to dwell and operate in him, than to suppose it only of a Portion of God, or of God but partially consider'd. He produces two or three Texts of Scripture on which he grounds this Conception, as *Col. 2. 9. In him dwells all the Fulness of the Godhead or Deity: and John 14. 10. The Father that dwells in me, he doth the Works. Acts 10. 38.* So that Mr. E. is so far from intending to speak evil of Christ, that what he says, he grounds conscientiously upon what Christ says of himself, and what the Apostle Paul says of him, and with a design to honour him.

Now, Gentlemen, if Mr. E. was so far from intending any Dishonour to our Saviour Jesus Christ in what he wrote, that he thought it more honourable to him than the contrary, and intended it to that purpose; what Evidence could you possibly have that he wrote those things blasphemously? and if you had no Evidence of it, and notwithstanding will assert it upon your Oaths, and thereby expose Mr. E. to a Sentence that fines him more a great deal, perhaps twice as much as he is ever able to pay, and consequently

to a long and perpetual Imprisonment, or an early Death by that Imprisonment; how will you answer it to your own Consciences all the time of your Life, much more at the time when you shall appear before the Judgment-Seat of Christ to receive the Reward of this Judgment?

Let me now ask you what Evidence you had of Mr. E's writing, or causing that Libel to be printed, and publishing it? I observe (tho I know not whether you did) the Indictment says, *wrote and caus'd to be printed*: It was not enough that you had Evidence that he caus'd it to be printed, and publish'd it, but you should have had it prov'd that he wrote it. My Information says, that all that was prov'd was, that he publish'd it, and that his writing it was found by you upon Presumption, which you were told from the Bench, *might be as good Evidence as positive Proof.* But who does not know that the strongest Presumptions have been afterwards found to be false Evidence? It's a sad but a well-known Story of a Mother and her two Sons in Gloucestershire, who some years since were found guilty of murdering a Man upon presumptive Evidence, and the Sons were hang'd in Chains; but afterwards, to the astonishment of the Jury-men, the murder'd Man came home. I was acquainted with one of those Jury-men, an honest and pious Man, but led, it seems, into this great Error by the Judge's magnifying presumptive Evidence: the poor Man in doleful Despair could not endure his own Country, but came to London, and liv'd in Obscurity. Now how you could discharge your selves of your Oath upon a mere Presumption, which ought always to be taken in favour of the Prisoner, I know not. I presume as well as you that he did write it, but I will not upon single Presumption give it upon my Oath.

But supposing that which however is not prov'd, what Law has Mr. E. broken? He does heartily and most sincerely believe whatsoever is written in the H. Scripture concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ, and he believes it in the best sense he can understand.



understand it in consistency with it self. Now the sixth Article of the Church of England says, *That nothing ought to be required of any Man as necessary to be believed—but what is read in Scripture, or may be prov'd thereby:* And he asserts nothing in his Book that he does not heartily believe is either expressly written in Holy Scripture, or which after many years Study of the same Scripture with all such Helps (as Prayers to God thro Christ, &c.) he is capable of, he believes to be the true Sense of those Scriptures. Now what Law has he herein transgress'd? What Statute or Common Law makes this Blasphemy? He does not deny (as appears by his Case) those three modal Distinctions by which Divines do usually explain the Trinity, viz. Life, Understanding, and Will; nor St. Austin's Trinity of Mind, Wisdom, and Love. Mr. E. acknowledges also the Union of the Divine and Human Nature in Vid. Mr. E's these Words, viz. *The infinite God is in an unspeakable manner united to and present with the Man Christ Jesus, dwelling and operating in him, actuating and managing him by a fix'd perpetual Influence, as the governing Principle.* Where again is that Law that makes it Blasphemy for any Man to infer from plain Scriptures, that there is a God above Christ, or who is Christ's Head and his God; *That Christ is not the absolutely Supreme God; or that there is no God the Son in the same sense, or in the same Supreme Essence with the Father?* I do not determine whether to infer so is erroneous or not: but where is it forbid as Blasphemy, and made liable to such a Sentence as is pass'd upon Mr. E? So likewise to infer from Christ's saying, *My Father is greater than I;* and from his delivering up the Kingdom to God, even the Father; and the Son also himself being subject to him that put all things under him: to infer, I say, from these and other Texts, *That Jesus Christ in his highest Capacity is inferior to the Father, and not the same God to which he is subject;* Where is

that Law that forbids that Inference under the penalty of Blasphemy? If there be no such Law, neither in our Statute Books, nor Common Law (as many of our Learned in the Law say) then this Judgment against Mr. E. is of dismal consequence, as a Precedent wherein the Judges and the Court do in a sort make that to be Law, which is not Law, and the different Senses of learned Men in the expounding of Scripture to be Blasphemy, when that Sense does not agree with their Mind, or with the Opinion of the Vulgar or the many that cry out against it. I say, the Precedent is of dismal consequence, for so no learned Man that asserts any Sense of Scripture different from the Sense of other learned Men, who are apt enough to give it the name of *Impious, Heretical, and Blasphemous,* but if the contrary Party can get a Lord Chief Justice and his Assessors on his side, he may run his Antagonist: for it's not hard, it seems, to get a Jury to bring him in *Guilty*, yea tho there be but presumptive Evidence. Are we come to this in the Reign of our most gracious and religious Queen, that the Judges shall make that to be Law, which the Subjects can't know to be such, and inflict what Penalties they please upon learned Men for writing Controversies, and deprive 'em of their Liberty, and confine them during their whole Life? For this is the Precedent they have set us. Dr. Sherlock the Reverend Dean of Paul's, and Mr. Bingham may hence see that their Liberties and Estates too would have been in hazard, had our Judges been of the same mind with Dr. South and the Oxford Heads; that Doctor and Mr. Bingham had been indicted for falsely, impiously, and heretically (it had been as easy to have added *blasphemously and maliciously*) writing, causing to be printed, and publishing a certain great Book, wherein they asserted, *That the three Persons in the Trinity are three distinct infinite Minds or Spirits, and three individual Substances.* There might have been found Jury-men enough at Oxford to have found them *Guilty*. This would have

have been a short way with the Dean to have depriv'd him of his Deanery and all other Benefices, and to have condemn'd both him and Mr. B. to perpetual Imprisonment, by laying upon 'em a Fine of about as much again as they are worth. Let any Man that can, shew me the difference of these two Cases.

And I hope I shall not offend my Lord Bishop of Sarum, if I say his Notion of the Divine Inhabitation seems to be very like to, if not the same with Mr. Emlyn's; for my Lord is charg'd by the Oxford Divines in an Examination of his Exposition, &c. that such an Inhabitation of God in a Creature, by which that Creature was not only call'd God, but that Adoration was due to it upon that account, was a Notion that could not have scandaliz'd the Jews, &c. From this, I say, and some other Expressions of my Lord's, he is charg'd with these Opinions as necessarily flowing from them; 1. That the Name of God may be justly ascribed to a Creature. 2. That a Creature may be the lawful Object of religious Adoration. 3. That

The Exposit. a local Presence and In-dwelling of the Godhead in examin'd, p. 3. Christ, without a proper and essential Union, was sufficient to entitle the Man Christ Jesus to the Name and Worship of God. Now supposing a Lord Chief Justice or other Judges of the same mind with the Oxford Divines, and my Lord had been indicted in form, for falsely, impiously, and blasphemously writing, printing, and publishing these Assertions; do you think, Gentlemen, that a Grand and a Petty Jury might not be found at Oxford, the one to write *Billa Vera* upon it, and the other to bring in a Verdict of my Lord Bishop of Sarum's being guilty, &c.? And I fear that if my Lord Bishop of Gloucester were to have his Trial before such Judges and such a Jury as you, his Assertions in his twenty eight Propositions, which clearly agree with those that Mr. E. is condemn'd for, his Lordship would fall under the very same Sentence: nay if

only *Edward Glouc.* he put in the Indictment instead of *Tho. Emlyn*, his Lordship is condemn'd already. For if Mr. E. is condemn'd for saying that if *Christ* has a God above him, then is he not the absolutely Supreme God; his Lordship has said that which is equivalent. Pr. 1. The Name of God is us'd in more Senses than one in Holy Scripture. Pr. 4. God the Father alone is in reference to his manner of Existence an absolutely perfect Being; because he alone is self-existent. Pr. 5. He alone, consequently, is absolutely perfect, in reference to those Perfections, which do presuppose Self-Existence. Pr. 6. These Perfections are absolute Independence, and being the first Original of all other Beings; in which the Son and Holy Ghost are comprehended. Pr. 10. Since the Father alone is a Being of the most absolute Perfection, he having those Perfections which the other two are incapable of having; He alone is God in the absolute highest Sense. What is this less than Mr. E's saying, that *Christ* is not the absolute Supreme God? Hence it's very manifest, his Lordship's Liberty, Dignity, Estate, and Freedom from perpetual Imprisonment, depend not on the Laws, but upon his good Fortune, in not meeting with Prosecutors, and zealous Judges of a contrary mind, together with some ignorant or over-credulous Juries, who are easy to be found. And I know not what you Gentlemen and your Court would have done with Dr. Bull, who in his *Defensio Fidei Nicene*, has a long Section *De subordinationem Filii ad Patrem*; but it's somewhat hard to understand how God the Son should be subordinate to God the Father, and yet equal in the Supreme Essence: yet to him, and to the late most Learned Dr. Cudworth, the Bishop of Gloucester refers us for the account of the Agreement of several of the Nicene Fathers, even *Athanasius* himself, and others of the Antients, to what he had propos'd, Pr. 28.

I could name several other Learned Men, who are by their Writings liable



to Mr. *Emlyn's* Judgment and Condemnation; but I think I have given Instances enough to make all Men of free minds look about 'em, and ingage both in Justice and Interest to be zealous for the revoking of his Judgment.

I cannot much blame you, Gentlemen, for giving credit to the Judges that these Clauses were criminal and blasphemous at Common Law, because the Judges are appointed, and it is their Duty to assist the Jury in the point of Law, especially the Common Law, which is not easy to be found out: but I can't but blame you, that in a point of Religion you should not examine the Book it self, and like the *Bereans* search the Scriptures, to see and judg whether what Mr. *E.* was charg'd with was true and agreeing with Scripture or not, and accordingly to have judg'd or suspended your Judgment, and brought in a special Verdict. But that you should without such Examination determine concerning the Falsity of it, and not only that, but of its Contrariety to Law, and that upon a partial proof: and that you should not only judg it upon your Oaths to be false and contrary to Law, but also impious, blasphemous, and malicious; and not only so, but that Mr. *E.* your Neighbour, of whom you never heard any ill thing, as I persuade my self, but a great deal of good, should be judg'd by you to have written and publish'd this Book, with those Clauses, impiously, blasphemously, and maliciously: I will say no more, but sit down and admire that such *English* Juries should be found, and pray God to give you Repentance that you may be forgiven. But where there

wants Confession and Restitution in case of Injury to Men, there is no Forgiveness from God. Therefore I see not, but that in order to Forgiveness, you ought to consult and agree together to go to the Judges, and others that are concern'd in the Execution of the Sentence grounded upon your Verdict, confessing that it was given upon Inconsideration, Ignorance, and Rashness; and that you were carried away by the Clamour of the People, and your too much deference to the Judges, to give a false Judgment: that you revoke it, and beseech them to revoke their Sentence and Condemnation built thereupon. How you can any other way be capable of Remission either from the just God injur'd Men, I beseech you to consider. I say injur'd Men, for in your Verdict (so call'd) against Mr. *Emlyn*, you have (as I have said) made a Precedent for the Prosecution and Ruin of most of the Learned Men in the two Kingdoms; who hereafter may be fin'd, sentenc'd, and imprison'd by the Assistance of such a Jury as you were.

Here I might aggravate the Grievousness of your Verdict, from the sad Tendency of it to the Vindication of the Persecutions by the *Roman* Church of those that dissented from her, upon the ground of conscientious Expositions of Scripture, as all the Reformers did, and do still; and withal to the Condemnation of the Reformers, and casting the Guilt upon their own Heads: But I leave what I have said to your serious Consideration, hoping you will (like Men of Integrity) review what you have done, and either approve it or repent of it.



**F I N I S.**

A  
VINDICATION  
OF THE  
WORSHIP  
OF THE  
**Lord Jesus Christ,**  
ON THE  
Unitarian Principles :

In Answer to what is said on that Head  
by Mr. Jos. Boyse, in his *Vindication of  
the Deity of Jesus Christ.*

---

*O Son of David, have mercy upon us.* The Liturgy.

He (*Origen*) saith, *We ought to pray only to the God over all, and to his only Son the First-born of every Creature, who as our High Priest, offers our Prayers to his God and our God.* Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Idolat. of the Church of Rome, p. 130.

---

*Note, the References are made to the 4<sup>to</sup> Edition of Mr. B's Book.*

---

M. DCC. V.





RECEIVED  
JUN 2

## *Mr. B's Argument for the Supreme Deity of J. Ch. from the Worship paid to him, consider'd and answer'd.*

**H**OW popular soever the Argument may seem, when from the Worship due to our Lord *Jesus*, the *Trinitarians* infer his Supreme Deity; and how great soever the imaginary Triumphs are, with which Mr. B. flatters himself upon this head, as tho he had quite baffled the Cause of the *Unitarians*, yet I doubt not, but by a thorough Examination, and right stating of this matter, upon *Unitarian* Principles, to answer the Arguments, and to overthrow the Opinion of their Adversarys, by making it plain, that no truly Divine Worship, or Supreme Adoration, is, upon Christian Principles, given to the Blessed *Jesus*, which is the Supposition Mr. B. goes on.

Let it first be premis'd, to prevent Obscurity and Confusion, That the Term *Divine*, when added to Worship, may be used as equivocally, or in as different senses, as is the Term *God*, to which it relates: For as this

is used sometime for the absolutely Supreme Being, or First Cause, and at other times for one of inferior Authority; just so *Divine* Worship may either signify what is given to the Supreme, or what is due only to an Inferior Being of subordinate Authority. For in the same sense as the Object is Divine, the Worship of it is so. And in this lower sense I understand *Socius*, when he pleads for Divine Worship to be given to *J. C.* since he expressly says, he intends by it not the same as is given to the Father, but much less. See his *Epist. 3. ad Rodeicum*; where speaking of that Text, *That all may honour the Son as they honour the Father*, he denies it to signify *plenam similitudinem*; and says, that he means *non minimam differentiam*, no little, a mighty Difference between the Worship due to God, and that due to *J. C.* tho he calls this *Divine* Worship too.



If this were duly consider'd, Mr. B. and others might have spared their pains in proving the Absurdity of giving Divine Worship in the highest sense (which Socinus was not for) to one who is not God in the highest sense. Therefore I shall freely grant the Absurdity of that Point, and so need not concern my self with that part of Mr. B's Argument, which Mr. E. never gave him any ground to expatiate so upon. I shall use the Terms *Divine Worship* in his own sense, for what is most properly such; and agree with him in the general Notion of it; that it imports the *Respect due to a Being of Infinite Excellency, and Supreme Authority, which only the Blessed God is possess'd of*; whether it be internal Worship or external. So p. 107. But I do maintain, in opposition to what he asserts to the contrary, that the Holy Scriptures, 1. Do never require us to pay such Divine Worship to our Blessed Saviour J. C. as he is distinct from the Father, who dwells in him, and is worship'd by us. 2. But that they do allow and require us to pay him an inferior Religious Worship.

These two Points answer the whole of Mr. B's, and other Trinitarians Arguments, on this Head of Worship.

First, I utterly deny that the Scriptures require any such Divine Worship of J. C. or that any Injury is done to our most dear and blessed Saviour, by not giving him the same Supreme Worship which we give to the Father. All Mr. B's Citations from Scripture, are very short of proving his Point. He first brings on for a general Proof, that Text, *John 5, 22, 23. That all should honour the Son as they honour the Father.* Whence he would infer that it must be the same, and as great Honour, as is due to the Father. Whereas Mr. E. had said, it only design'd to oblige us to

honour the Son as truly (not equally) as the Father; which Dr. Whitby tells *Idolat. of the us was the Great Ori- Ch. of Rome, gen's Comment, and p. 223.* therefore not only Mr. E's presumptuous Addition, as Mr. B. insinuates.

I shall wave the Inquiry, whether the Text speaks of the Honour of Worship, or not rather of that of Obedience, (for *honorandus* and *adorandus* are two things) But supposing it to relate to the former, the whole Stress of Mr. B's Argument must lie upon the Particle *as*, which he supposes to be a Note of Equality, or Identity: but if it only denote the Reality of the thing, or some Resemblance, tho of an inferior nature and degree, then all his Argument is spoil'd. And indeed it happens for him very ill, that the Particle *as* scarcely ever notes more than Similitude. This is so obvious and vulgar a Remark, that 'tis a wonder Mr. B. should begin with so weak an Argument, which he knew every one could except against; which yet he says nothing to remove. As well might he prove Christ's Disciples to be equal Objects of the Father's Love with himself, because he says, that he loved them as he loved him, *John 17. 23.* Nay, thus it will help the Socinians to a good Argument, viz. That the Father and Son are no more one Being than a Multitude of Believers, because they are one, as the Father and Son are one, ver. 22. i. e. equally one, according to this sense. Whereas indeed such Expressions only note a general Similitude in the Reality of the thing. 'Tis plain our Lord intends no more, but that as the Father had his Honour, so the Son had some due to himself, by the Father's Favour; and therefore he adds, that he that honours not the Son, honours not the Father who sent him. He does not say, he that honours him not as much

much as the Father; no, but *he that does not honour him*, offends the Father. As he who despised an Apostle despised *J. C.* who sent him; so to reject, or not honour *J. C.* his Son, is a Contempt to the Father, whose Messenger he was: on which account only the Text requires us to honour him, *viz.* as having God's Commission, and consequently could never intend an Equality of Honour to him and the Father; only that as the Father was to be honour'd highly, so some great Honour ought to redound to the Son of *such* a Father, and so authoriz'd by him. 'Tis to so little purpose that this Text is alledg'd to prove equal Worship due to Christ as to the Father; that I shall hereafter from *hence* prove that the Worship due to Christ is of an inferior Nature. But let us next consider the particular Instances of Worship given to *J. C.* which he pretends are *Divine* Worship.

I need not trouble my self to answer the particular Texts he cites, to shew that Prayer is to be made to *J. C.* nor to distinguish which only are pertinent, and which do not concern *him*, or do not imply Prayer to him; because I rely upon other Answers.

I observe not one Instance of Prayer to *J. C.* when absent, either requir'd in the Precept, or reported in the Example, thro the whole New Testament, only what is suppos'd under the general Phrase of *calling on his Name*. Stephen saw him visibly, *Acts* 7. And those Instances, *1 Thess.* 3. 11. *2 Cor.* 13. 13. seem to be only *Wishes*, just like those in the Salutations at the beginning of most of the Epistles, which either are no Prayers, or may not be directed to *J. C.* tho they be for Benefits by him. 'Tis but like that Prayer, *Rev.*

1. 4. *Grace be to you*

\* *Exercitat. on from the seven Spirits; Zech.* 4. 10. which \* *Mr. Jos. Mede*

has clearly prov'd to be seven Angels (as *Mr. Baxter* and others cannot deny or disown) and says that it may be a Prayer for Benefits by their Ministry, tho directed to God, as *Gen.* 48. 16. We may say Peace and Protection from good Angels be to you, and yet not pray to them. So may the Apostle say, *the Grace of Christ, and the Communication of the Holy Ghost be to you;* and yet only pray to the Father for it.

So then I see no Instance of Prayer to *J. C.* when absent and invisible: only we read of Christians *calling on his Name*. If that Phrase signify any more than professing his Name, *saying Lord, Lord*, or using his Name in Worship, yet it can amount to no more, under the Gospel-Constitution, than calling on him as *Mediator*, to come in to our help as an Intercessor; But I deny this Prayer to be *Divine* Worship of him, or to be the same with praying to God, as the ultimate Object thro a Mediator. He may be sought to as Mediator, as he was by *St. Stephen*, when he saw him *standing at God's Right Hand*, ver. 56. *i. e.* in a ministering posture as an Advocate: but he is never the ultimate Object of Supreme Worship; and no transient subordinate Worship is to be given to the Supreme God, but only to a subordinate Being; to which I may not give the *Divine Honour* of terminating my Faith, Worship, and Rest in him, without seeking to go further, even to God, his and my Father.

It should seem, that he forbids such Prayer to himself, as belongs to God his Father; *John* 16. 23. *In that day ye shall ask me nothing, but shall ask the Father in my Name*. On which words *Origen* condemns direct Prayer to *J. C.* (*i. e.* other than praying to God by him) † *Dr. Whitby* as *Dr. Whitby* † observes. *on the Text*.

'Tis evident by the Context, that he speaks of asking  
B 2 in



in Prayer, rather than of *asking Questions*; because he opposes to it their *asking the Father in his Name*, which will not be deny'd to relate to Prayer. And tho the Word do often signify to ask by Inquiry, yet does it also signify to ask by Intreaty or Prayer, as well as the other Word in the latter Clause; as appears *ver. 26.* where Christ uses it in saying, *I will pray the Father for you*; and the Context more fairly introduces this Sense. And indeed if they might pray to him universally for all things, I cannot see any pretence why they might not as well ask Instruction, and the Solution of their Difficulties, as any thing else: He plainly represents them as in a craving Condition; *In that day ye shall ask, &c. v. 26.* And I believe as long as they would want other things, they should want Instruction (even when inspir'd) more and more. And therefore to suppose, our Lord should tell 'em they would not need to ask any more for Information, whilst yet on Earth, and whilst they would be craving other Mercies, seems to me a wild Supposition: For can it be thought that the Apostles never pray'd to God the Father, for Information and Light in any point, after *J. C.* had ascended? We are told by some, that when St. John (who records this Text) set about writing this very Gospel, he engag'd the *Asian Bishops* to assist him by Prayer and Fasting; and did he not pray himself, think we, for Light and Instruction? So that it seems very hard to understand Christ's words of *such asking*; and if they had occasion to ask the Father, why not him too, if an equal Object of Worship? No, they should indeed ask the Father, but not him; save as Mediator to offer their Prayers to the Father, not as the ultimate Object.

And 'tis apparent, that the current Method of the *New Testament* is to pray to God by *J. C.* or in his Name

as our Intercessor, *ver. 26.* And this is the constant Strain of the truly primitive Writers, as appears in *Clemens Romanus*, in *Polycarp's Prayer*, in *Origen*, &c. they offer'd their Prayers to *J. C.* as their *High Priest*, to present them to God. So that tho it seem, in some sort, to be one Act of Worship, yet is there a Subordination in the two Objects that are so conjoin'd, whether I pray expressly to God, or *J. C.* For if I pray to God, 'tis that he will accept and help me thro *J. C.* and if I pray to *J. C.* 'tis that he will help me by interceding with the Father. 'Tis God only to whom I principally and ultimately pay my Worship, tho I honour the Son as my great Advocate, and Priest to present it with advantage. This is the plain easy Sense of the Gospel. I no otherwise call on him, than as I believe on him, and come to him, which is only as the way to the Father, not as to the Supreme himself, which he never requires.

Next Mr. B. comes to the *Internal Acts of Worship*, viz. Faith and Love, &c. 'Tis but poor arguing to say, that because we must trust in *J. C.* therefore it must be with the same Faith and Respect, as Trust in God implies; when 'tis plain *J. C.* propounds two Objects of Faith, *John 14. 1. Ye believe in God, believe also in me.* He that trusts in Man so as to forget God, or depart from him as his main Stay, is *cursed*; but as I may safely believe in, or believe (the Phrase in Scripture importing the same) a faithful Man or Prophet, as the *Israelites* did believe in *Moses*, *Exod. 14. 31.* so much more in *J. C.* And yet 'tis one thing to trust in one as a subordinate Minister, and another as the Supreme Author and End of all. By him we believe in God, says the Scripture, *1 Pet. 1. 21.* So that it seems he is not the ultimate Object of Faith, and so is not prov'd to be God, by any Faith

Faith in him which the Gospel requires.

The like I say of our Love to J. C. Here I find Mr. B. is sadly baffled, when he pretends to prove J. C. to be the Object of the same Supreme Love as God his Father claims, from Scripture. The Texts which he brings to shew it, do plainly evidence on the contrary, how warily the Writers of the N. T. avoided it: Love thy God, says J. C. with all thy Heart and all thy Soul, &c. Mat. 22. 37. But when he bids us love himself, he uses no such Terms, but only bids us love him above Father and Mother, and all this lower World, Mat. 10. 37. Again, says Paul (when he describes Christians by this Love to J. C.) they love our Lord Jesus in Sincerity, Eph. 6. 24. Is this the same as to love him equal to God, with supreme Love? Far be it from me to think that I can love that blessed Saviour equal to his transcendent Love to me, or that ever I can love him enough with a regular Gospel Love; in comparison of whom all in the World is but *Loss and Dung*; and I humbly own it is my Sin, that I am so defective in Love to so dear a Benefactor, and so great a Lord: yet I am sensible that our Esteem and rational Love must ascend higher than he, and not rest till it center in his God and ours. I challenge any one to produce a Text for the supreme ultimate Love of J. C.

Nor are we ultimately to dedicate our selves to him, but to God thro him, Heb. 7. 26. to him only as our Mediator: and so did Christians dedicate themselves ministerially to the Apostles, 1 Cor. 8. 5. under Christ.

The same I say, as to all other Parts of Worship internal or external. 'Tis to no purpose to say, that this or that Honour is given to him, which bears the same general Name with what is given to the Father, un-

less it can be shown that it has the same high and ultimate Respect to J. C. which the same common Name, or joint Exercise, is no proof of at all. I shall ever stand to it, that no Worship is truly Divine, but what is ultimate and supreme; and Mr. B. himself must remember, that in his Description of the Nature of Divine Worship, he has imply'd so much, in saying 'tis the Respect due only to a Being of supreme Excellency and Authority: But he will never shew me one Instance where J. C. is respected in any part of Worship, as one of supreme Authority, or as higher than Mediator; which he owns is an inferior Character.

Nay, more than once Mr. B. is forc'd to grant that the Father only is the ultimate Object of Worship, p. 145. (of which more presently) which subverts all his pretended Proofs for Divine Worship of J. C. when he grants in effect, that he has no ultimate Worship. What! Is transient mediatorial Honour the highest that Man can give to God? Or is he God most High, to whom none of the highest Worship is paid? He, besides whom, there is one to whom Worship is more eminently due than to him? as Mr. B. allows, p. 24. These are great Absurdities.

As to Baptism into the Name of Christ, 'tis but a lifting our selves under him, as God's commission'd Son and Minister, as the very Introduction to the Ministerial Commission shews, Mat. 28. 18, 19. All Power, says J. C. is given me of my Father: Go and baptize, &c. Just as the Soldier is listed under his Colonel, as well as under the King, and yet they two are not equal; and he is far more the Servant of his King than of the other, tho at once listed under both. The Sense of Christ's words there, is very justly given by a



a late Expositor, Chaplain to the  
Bishop of Norwich, qu.

*Paraphrase of* d. Baptize them into the  
*Mr. Sa. Clark* Profession of that Gospel  
*on the Text.* Faith, which was re-

veal'd and sent by the

Father, brought and publish'd by the Son,  
and confirm'd by the Holy Spirit.

So that it signifies nothing, that the Son is join'd with the Father, towards the Proof of the Son's receiving equal Honour to his, any more than it will prove that the Apostles had the same Honour with J. C. because their Disciples gave, or dedicated themselves (the great business of Baptism) to the Lord and also to them, 2 Cor. 8. 5. or that Moses was equally honour'd with God, because at once Israel believ'd in both, Exod. 14. 31. as they did at once worship both God and King David, 1 Chron. 29. 20. Mr. B. is hard put to it, when he knows not how to excuse this latter, without supposing they first bow'd to God, and then turn'd about to worship the King, when the Text speaks of it more like one single Act: and this was in effect the same, as to have said in words, *We give Honour to God and the King.* I ask Mr. B. whether he be baptiz'd in the Mediator's Name, i. e. (with him) in the Name of the Son of God, and the Son of Man both? Dares he say the Son of Man is excluded, and that he has no Honour in our Service, nor is regarded in our Baptism? And if we are baptiz'd inio him as the Son of Man also, or into his whole Person, then are we baptiz'd jointly into the Name of God and of a Creature (for the Man Christ is no more) and 'tis a false Suggestion to say that the Three into whose Names we are baptiz'd, are to be taken for one God. This is unwarrantable Presumption.

'Tis a poor Reply to the Instance of Israel's being baptiz'd into Moses, to say that we cannot produce such a Form for it as that of Christ's. What

then? Is not the thing it self, or the main End and Effect of it, as much as the Form? As weak is that Difference which he would make between the baptizing into Moses, and into his Name; when 'tis so evident that they import the same thing. See Gal. 3. 27. Rom. 6. 3. where they who were according to the usual Form of Baptism baptiz'd into his Name, are said only to have been baptiz'd into Christ; and sure the Person is at any time as much as his Name.

But if Mr. B. thinks the baptizing into the Name of one, should imply him to be the Supreme God; I shall clearly prove the contrary from 1 Cor. 1. 13, 15. *I thank God I baptiz'd none of you, &c.* says Paul, *lest any should say I had baptiz'd into my own Name.* Cou'd Paul suppose that by charging him with baptizing in his own Name, they meant to impeach him of setting up himself for God? No, the Context plainly shews that all his Apprehension about it was this, that they would have taken it as a ground of denominating themselves his Disciples, as they already were apt to do, saying, *I am of Paul, &c.* as tho he, instead of J. C. were the Head of their Profession, and Master of the Christian School. This he intimates would have justly follow'd from his baptizing into his own Name. But if it had imply'd him to be God most High, they could never be suppos'd to be so absurd, as to charge Paul with such a foolish and monstrous Crime. Which shews what was their Sense of the matter in hand in the beginning of Christianity.

So that to be baptiz'd into the Name of any one, is only to enter one's self his Disciple, and to be denominated after his Name; as they who were baptiz'd into Moses were Moses's Disciples, John 9. 28. They who were baptiz'd into John's Baptism, were John's Disciples, ch. 3. 25. So to be baptiz'd into the Name of Jesus, is to profess

profess our selves his Disciples, and to take his Name upon us. As the Wife and Servant did *transire in Nomen Mariti aut Domini*, were call'd after their Names, so we are call'd Christians from *Christ*; being baptiz'd into his Name, we are call'd his Disciples. And therefore in the Gospel-History we read only of Christians being baptiz'd into the Name of the Lord Jesus, *Acts* 2. 38. c. 19. 5. because they were eminently to bear the Mediator's Name, having before been the profess'd Subjects of God, under whom the Lord Jesus was now constituted the chief Head and Administrator.

Nor is the *Lord's Supper* any Instance of Divine Worship paid to J. C. tho it be a Celebration of the Memory of his Death. I grant there are concomitant Acts of Worship both in this and in *Baptism*, viz. Prayer and Praise, which are not requir'd to be offer'd to J. C. neither, but to the Father (for we must only do as he did, which was not to pray to himself) But that this of eating or drinking is any immediate Worship, Mr. B. will hardly prove. 'Tis an Act of Obedience, not of Worship as distinct from Obedience: At least 'tis no Act of external Worship distinct from Prayer, or from Love, and Faith, &c. which he must intend, because he distinguishes it from those Parts of Worship, as a particular distinct Instance. Something to this purpose, against its being immediate Worship, Mr. B. may find in a Book call'd, *Remarks on the Bishop of Derry's Discourse*, &c. p. 117.

Besides, we then remember J. C. in his Death only, or as a *Man slain*, where we see nothing that resembles him as a *God*, or that signifies any such matter to us: And all that Solemnity may justly belong to him, as an honourable Remembrance of so excellent a Friend, tho there were no pretence of a *Deity* in the case.

As to all external Acts of Worship,

they are wholly equivocal, and cannot determine what the Worship intended is. Let Mr. B. shew that God has appropriated any of these to the Supreme Being, and that they are given to J. C. He will own that our Lord J. receiv'd Homage as a *Prophet* only of eminent Sanctity, p. 75. which is moral Reverence, or religious Worship, such as *Peter* refus'd. By which 'tis plain, that such external Acts cannot prove his *Deity*.

The Objections from *Peter* and the *Angel*, who refus'd such Worship which J. C. receiv'd, without any check to them who gave it, are frivolous; since they two had no such Claim to that Worship, which he had; and therefore they might well refuse what it became him to accept. And sure he may challenge what an *Angel* refuses, and yet be below the Supreme God, tho greater than Angels. Nay, 'tis evident enough, that under the Old Testament Angels did receive as great Worship from others, as that which the Angel refus'd from *St. John*, because he was an Apostle, and so not much in Honour below Angels.

And what tho the *Angels of God* worship J. C.? This shews he is Lord over em, but not that he is their Supreme God. So that in all this Heap of seeming Arguments, which are rather numbred than weigh'd, here is not one that comes home to the purpose, so as to prove Supreme and Divine Worship to be due to J. C. Prayer, Praise, Love, Faith, Prostration, &c. may be given to one, so as to be Divine Worship, when ultimate and supreme; and to another, so as to be only subordinate: which it is, when given to J. C. for any thing that Mr. B. has made appear to the contrary.

Having thus in vain attempted to produce any one plain Instance of Divine Worship paid to J. C. from the Nature of the *Acts* themselves, he pretends next to prove it from the



Foundation on which those Acts of Worship are grounded, which, he says, are his *infinite divine Perfections and supreme Dominion*, p. 115. Now here I will join issue with him, and if he can shew me one Instance of Scripture, in which the Worship due to J. C. is ever grounded upon his *supreme Dominion or infinite Perfections*, I will yield up the Cause: But if contrariwise the Scripture always grounds his Worship upon his *deriv'd subordinate Authority*, or upon his Commission from the *Father*, then I must in all reason be allow'd to carry it.

Mr. B. thinks he does enough for his purpose, to strain some Texts for the proof of such Perfections being in him (which yet, in the Instances produc'd, are far from being infinite Perfections or supremely divine.) But I find he does not pretend to bring one Text, to shew that the Worship paid him is grounded on those Perfections themselves. On the other hand I observe, that when the grounds of Worship are mention'd in Scripture, 'tis expressly upon a limited and deriv'd Authority. John 5. 22, 23. *The Father committeth all Judgment to the Son, that all should honour the Son.* So Phil. 2. 9, 10, 11. *He has given him a Name above every Name, that at the Name of Jesus every Knee shall bow—to the Glory of the Father.* Is this like grounding his Worship upon supreme Dominion or Perfection, when 'tis wholly founded upon the *Father's* free Gift as a Reward? What! has the Father no higher grounds for the Worship he claims, than a borrow'd or bestow'd Power? Sure he is worship'd as the *God of Gods*, as one who possesses all Glory and Perfection of himself, and is beholden to none for what he is and has. 'Tis not possible a deriv'd dependent Being should be deem'd equal to a self-existent one, who gives the other all he has. And tho' this deriv'd one should have all

Power and universal Knowledge commensurate to the Earth or Church, yet are these things far from being infinite or supreme Perfections, or equal to the self-existent independent *Father*.

Nor will *Ministerial Creation* or Preservation, entitle him to Divine Worship: and I suppose Mr. B. can't shew more than this to be attributed to J. C. (whatever Creation it be, whether the Old or New that is spoken of) or that ever this it self is assign'd as the ground of Worship.

In the matter of *Redemption*, I see no shadow of any ground for Divine Worship, since he is therein consider'd only as a *Mediator* (which Mr. B. allows to be an inferior Character) who has redeem'd us by the Will and Command of his *Father*, and to the Glory of him as the Principal, Rev. 5. 9. *Thou hast redeem'd us to God.* Under that subordinate Consideration, the Church does there celebrate his Praises, and so can only intend a subordinate inferior Honour to him. So that upon the whole, they seem to go upon very slight and rash grounds, who give supremely divine Worship to J. C. for any thing that Mr. B. has said in vindication of it; since the whole Current of the New Testament is against him, as well as that of the first and purest Ages of *Christianity*: and since also 'tis so highly injurious to the Honour of the *Father*, in whom alone are found the solid grounds of Divine Worship, viz. native, original, infinite Perfection, and supreme underiv'd Dominion.

One would think it an invincible Argument against the supreme Worship of J. C. which Mr. B. had laid down, viz. in that the Worship given him is grounded on deriv'd and borrow'd Excellency. And 'tis but a poor come-off in Mr. B. when in answer to it, he says, p. 121. *If he mean by deriv'd and borrow'd Excellency, such Excellency*

*as God communicates to a dignify'd Creature, I deny that the Worship which the Scriptures require us to pay to Ch. is grounded on such deriv'd Excellency.* For as Mr. E. had said nothing at all, whether J. C. was ever created or not, (tho Mr. B. very unjustly charges him with it) or was only generated; so no doubt but, when he spake of deriv'd or given Excellency and Power, he meant it of such as is any way deriv'd and borrow'd, be it by Creation or Generation: and tho he had never such great Excellencys belonging to his Nature originally, that is, *ab origine*, yet if that Nature it self be but deriv'd (for Mr. B. grants his Essence is so) the Case is the same still; it can challenge but an inferiour respect: and unless he can shew, that to be deriv'd and dependent (let it be what way deriv'd he will) is as great a Perfection, as to be self-existent and independent, and that it challenges as great Veneration from us, he says nothing in all the rest that can avail his Cause.

Nothing can be more apparent, than that the Homage due to J. C. is not grounded upon any original infinite Excellency of his own, but on his Father's Grant. Words can hardly speak it more expressly than that Text, *Phil. 2. 9, 10, 11.* But Mr. B. catches at the Phrase, *That every Knee may bow to him*; and because he finds God had said of himself, *That to him every Knee should bow*, *Isa. 45. 23.* presently (according to his usual way of arguing, from the same or like words, to the same sense, without minding the difference of the Subjects they are apply'd to) he confidently concludes, p. 124. That J. C. must be the self-same God, to whom all Knees must bow: which is just as if because in one place I read I must love God, and in another that I must love my Neighbour; therefore I should conclude, that doubtless God and my

Neighbour are the same, because the same thing, viz. Love, is requir'd for both.

But 'tis not merely from the same words being apply'd to both God and Ch. that he proves them to be the same; but he thinks to father his Conclusion, and his way of inferring, on St. Paul, who alledges, *Rom. 14. 11, 12.* that, agreeable to the Declaration of God in the Prophet, of *every Knee's bowing to him*, as an Accomplishment of it, *We must all stand before the Judgment-Seat of Christ.* Now says Mr. B. *If the Apostle's Reasoning be just, our Saviour must be that Jehovah, to whom the Prophet had foretold, that every Knee should bow.* Why so? Else, says he, it would not follow, because every Knee should bow to God, that all must stand before the Judgment-Seat of Christ. But I think it will follow very well, without making St. Paul pass for a shallow Reasoner. Is it not a great Instance of God's prevailing Sovereignty and Dominion, and of the World's universal Subjection to it, that all are accountable to his Minister and Delegate? Is any so blind as not to see that it is God's Judgment and God's Authority is own'd, when his commission'd Judg is submitted to, as if it were himself? If a Prince say, I will have all my Subjects submit to my Authority, and from thence one concludes, that they must be accountable to his commission'd Judg, or Delegates; will it follow thence, that these Judges are the very King? Must St. Paul be censur'd as one that knew not how to argue justly, because he intends not such a weak Consequence, or rather such a *Non-sequitur*, as Mr. B. draws unreasonably from his Words? It is enough for justifying his Argument, that God the Father is bow'd to, in Mens Appearance at Christ's Bar as his Minister. I wonder Mr. B. should venture on such trifling Pretences.

C

But



But not being able to prove *divine* Worship to be due to *J. C.* with any reasonable Evidence, from clear Scripture-Instances, he endeavours next to bring it in at a Back-door. He finds that some Worship is to be given him: but, says he, *there is no religious Worship to be given to any but God alone;* and that all such religious inferior Worship as is given to another, is a giving away God's Peculiar, which he has appropriated to himself, and so is no better than *Idolatry*. And hence he concludes, that what Worship is given to *J. C.* is not this inferior Worship, and therefore it must be *divine*. Of these Principles I shall endeavour to shew the Falshood and Weakness.

That there is no Evidence brought by Mr. B. of any divine Worship due to *J. C.* I have already manifested. What remains next is,

*Secondly*, To shew, that there is an inferior religious Worship of *J. C.* which the Scripture allows; and to answer his Cavils and Exceptions against it, from that general Position of his (and others) *That all religious Adoration of any, but the supreme God, is Idolatry:* Like to that of the Pagans, which was oppos'd by the Primitive Fathers, &c.

*Arg. 1.* First then I maintain, that, *de facto*, there is an inferior Worship due to *J. C.* And this appears,

In that he is to be worship'd as *Mediator*. Now Mr. B. p. 26. grants, that as *Mediator* he is *inferior to the Father*. Whence it will follow, that the Worship paid him under this inferior Character, must needs be inferior Respect; because the relative Act must needs bear a proportion to its Object. Which side of the Question Mr. B. takes, *An Christus qua Mediator sit adorandus, an non?* I know not. But if he join with those who are for the Negative, I think he lifts himself among those who seem as ungrateful to the Redeemer for all his

rich Grace and Love, as any whom they accuse. 'Tis evident that they join not with that desirable Society, Rev. 3. 9, 12. who take so much pleasure in adoring and praising the *Lamb who was slain*, and that for shedding his Blood; which certainly is as *Mediator*: for the Lamb is only that Nature which was sacrific'd, or which became an Offering; so that the same Nature is intended to be honour'd which endur'd the Smart, and that Nature is glorify'd by the Saints, which was so by God. Nay I may, without rashness, venture to say, that to deny all Worship to the Man *J. C.* or to him as *Mediator*, and that as to one unworthy of it, is to put very great contempt on the B. I. 'Tis to run quite counter to the Scripture, and to contradict their triumphant Congratulations of the Redeemer's Honour, who say, *Worthy is the Lamb slain to receive Glory, Honour and Blessing, &c.* And if it should be found that there is no Son of God, but what is a distinct Being from the Father (as some verily believe) and to him they deny all Adoration as *Idolatrous*; I fear lest they be found among those who worship not the Son of God at all; and he that honours not the Son (even tho he be another Being from the Father) honours not the Father. In short, 'tis as *Mediator* that the grounds of Worship in Scripture do respect him.

Further, our Lord *J. C.* is in the same respect, an Object of Worship, as he is, an Object of Faith (for Mr. B. instances in Faith as a part of his internal Worship.) Now I would know if he dare say that we must not have Faith in him as *Mediator*. Nothing is more evident, than that the Scripture requires *mediate Faith* in him (which is but subordinate Worship) *Abraham believed in God, 1 Pet. 1. 21. So again, He believe in God, says Christ, believe also in me, John 14.*

1. i. e. as Mediator, as the Trinitarian Comments will tell us. So then here is Worship of him as Mediator, or as one inferior and subject to the Father; and therefore it cannot express a Respect equal to that of the Father.

Again, p. 122. Mr. B. allows, that as Mediator, he has all Dominion; and this is the true ground of Worship or Homage.

Nor indeed have the learned Trinitarians deny'd that he is to be pray'd to as Mediator. Mr. Jurin, in his *Pastoral Letters*, Vol. 3. Let. 13. shows, That the Papists do indeed make a difference between the Worship of Angels or Saints, and that of God, because they only pray to them as Mediators; but that they make none between that and the Worship of J. C. to whom, says he, we address thus, *Pray thou for us, intercede for us with thy Father.* This is without dispute to pray to him as Mediator, and in a subordinate inferior way, below our Prayers to the Father, or Supreme. So St. Stephen pray'd to Christ as Mediator, says Mr. Baxter, *His last Work*, because he pe-  
 tition'd for an Act of  
 ro. to which he Mediation; Acts 7.  
 refers in his Pa- Now mediate and ul-  
 raphrase. timate Worship must

needs be unequal, and the former be as much inferior to the latter, as the Mediator, *qua talis*, is to the Father, with Mr. B.'s own Consent.

Again, I argue from the usual Apostolick Salutations at the beginning of most of the Epistles (which Mr. B. risks not to mention for one of his Proofs of Divine Worship in Prayer to J. C.) *Grace and Peace from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.* From hence I argue, that (even according to the Trinitarians) J. C. can not be pray'd to here as God, but as Mediator below God, and therefore

with inferior Worship: which I gather thus, I observe the *Holy Spirit* is never once join'd with the Father and the Son in those Salutations; so that either he is wholly left out from among the Persons worship'd by Christians; or the word *Father* must be taken for the whole Deity, including the three Persons, as they sometimes tell us; there is no other way to fetch in the third Person into this Worship. If Mr. B. will say, that God the Father notes the first Person of the Trinity, and J. C. the Lord, the second Person, then the Spirit is not included in the Object of Divine Worship at all. What shall be said to this? Is this to make the Holy Spirit equal to the other two? What, to pray distinctly to two Persons in particular, all along, and never once to the third? What is this, but plainly to teach all the Churches that there was no third Person of equal Honour; since he would not have been so constantly neglected by the Apostles in their publick Worship? Well then, I suppose to avoid this the Trinitarians must say, that the Term *Father* is put for the whole Deity, including the three Persons. But tho this is very odd, and looks like a shift for a desperate Cause, to say that the Father, when distinguish'd from the Son of a Father, as 2 John ver. 13. shou'd be put for the Father and the Son; yet allowing this, that the second and third Persons are included in the Father, I then ask what shall be intended by the Lord J. C. join'd with the Father? It can't be said that he is pray'd to as the second Person there, because he is suppos'd to be included as such in the Term *Father*. There he is consider'd as God among the three, and therefore it would be a gross and groundless *Tautology* to pray to him again under the same Character as God. Or why shou'd he be mention'd first in gene-



ral and common, and then in particular, more than the other two Persons? So then it must be granted, I conceive, that having been pray'd to before in common as God, according to them, he is next particularly pray'd to as *Mediator*, and not as God; and then I have what I design, viz. a proof that he is worship'd as Mediator, and as inferior to the Father; and consequently, that inferior religious Worship is paid him in the New Testament, neither *Divine*, nor yet *Idolatry*.

Arg. 2. Because J. C. cannot be worship'd with *divine* supreme Worship (according to Mr. B. and other *Trinitarians*) therefore 'tis with inferior Worship if at all. The reason why he cannot be worship'd with *supreme* Worship is, because (as Mr. B. will allow) there is no Worship of God the *supreme* Being, according to the Gospel, but what must be offer'd thro Christ as the Mediator (that is, says Mr. B. and others, a God-Man.) Now if Christ be to be worship'd with *divine* Worship as God supreme, who can be the Mediator, where Christ himself is the *ultimate* Object? What *God-Man* comes between Christ's *divine* Nature, and the suppliant Sinner? So that if I worship him with *divine* Worship as God, then 'tis worshipping God without a Mediator; but since this is not Gospel-worship, 'tis not to be maintain'd, that any Instances of Worship paid to J. C. in the New Testament are of this nature, viz. *divine* supreme Worship, but only inferior Respect.

And indeed Mr. B. being press'd with this Argument, grants the main point, viz. *That the divine Nature, as in the Father, is the ultimate Object of our Addresses.* So again, p. 24. *The Father is, sometimes in Scripture, propos'd as the ultimate Object of religious Worship, Eph. 2. 18. Thro him we have access to the Father, i. e. to the divine Nature as pri-*

*marily subsisting in the Father.* He must mean, that the Father *only* is the *ultimate* Object, else 'tis nothing to his purpose; for he gives it as an Answer to the Question, Who is Mediator when the *divine* Nature in the Son is the *ultimate* Object of Worship? To this he answers, the *divine* Nature as in the Father is the *ultimate* Object; that is, as in him only, and not as in Christ: for if Christ also be such an *ultimate* Object of *divine* Worship, then the Difficulty remains unanswered, in such Worship of him, who being the *ultimate* Object, cannot be the *Mediator* also in the same Worship; since that would be to mediate only with himself (which the Father may do as well as the Son) whereas 'tis evident the Mediator in Scripture is understood of another distinct Person, and implies such Mediation as belongs not to the Father to act in, but the Son only.

Mr. B. cannot say (as we may) that the human Nature acts alone, in this Mediation with his *divine*, because he denies it to be capable of *knowing the Hearts of Men* (without which there can be no sufficient Mediation for them) for he says, this is peculiar to God, and *solely* is to be found in him, not only in the most eminent sense, as Mr. E. had said, but in any sense.

Besides then it will follow, that the Man J. C. is a sufficient Mediator of Intercession with God the Father too, and there will need no second Person in the Deity for this matter; for surely such a Mediator as will suffice with the *divine* Nature in the Son, may suffice as well with the same Nature in the Father, if they be equal in Justice and Glory: So that one *divine* Person, together with the Man J. C. will answer the whole Affair of Worship by a Mediator. And if it will suffice for *Intercession*, I suppose it will easily follow, that the human Nature

of Christ may also suffice in the business of *Redemption*; because these two are suppos'd to be connected and dependent one on the other: and we are oft told (in arguing against the Papists) that none can be a sufficient Mediator of Intercession, but who is also of *Redemption* by his Sacrifice, on which they say his Intercession is grounded. If therefore the human Nature in Christ can sufficiently act the part of Mediation in it self, without the interceding Mediation of the divine, in one part of it, viz. *Intercession*; then it must be suppos'd to have had the same Sufficiency in the other, viz. as a *Propitiation*. Moreover, there will be the very same Objection against Christ's mediating with his own divine Nature and Justice, by way of atonement, in his own divine Virtue, as there is against his mediating with his own divine Nature, in Intercession, in that same divine Virtue: for to satisfy himself, is no Satisfaction to the Demands of his Justice, 'tis to sit down without any amends; just as to intercede with himself only, is to do it without any proper Intercessor at all.

If it be said that the human Nature could not do this but from the Dignity it receives by the personal Union to the divine Nature, and therefore there must be a *God-Man* in the Case: I answer, That Union it self could not make the human Creature infinite, nor truly divine, and therefore not a Subject of infinite Virtue and Merit neither; if any such Virtue be, it must be reckon'd only to the divine Nature, and then all the Mediation bottom'd on it, will be still in its own Virtue, which is to mediate with it self. Besides, the Unitarians will allow the Man J. C. to be united to the Father, who dwells in him, and who was manifested in his Flesh: And if that Rule of the Trinitarians be allow'd, that the word *God*

put absolutely does use to signify the Father, who is eminently stil'd God (as says Mr. B. also) then such Texts as speak of *God's being manifest in Flesh*, and of *God's purchasing the Church with his Blood*, may be understood of the Father, and so do intimate as near an Union of him to the Man J. C. as can be pretended of any (suppos'd) second Person in the Deity. So that we may gain this point, that to assert only one Person in the divine Nature, is enough to answer the Gospel-account of Christ's Mediation with God for Sinners.

This I say only follows, in case any Trinitarian should be driven to say, that only the human Nature acts in mediating with the divine Nature of J. C. when 'tis ultimately and divinely worship'd (without which he is not worship'd as God) as they must say, except it be worship'd without a Mediator, to come between this God and us, which is against the Gospel. In short, either Mr. B. must say, That the most High God J. C. (to use the Trinitarian, not Scripture-Dialect) is approachable by us without a Mediator, against Scripture; or that the Man J. C. is a sufficient Mediator in his created Nature; or that he is not worship'd as God at all, so as to need any Mediator. Either of the two latter will serve the Unitarians, tho' 'tis the last that I am now driving at, viz. that J. C. is not worship'd as supreme God, or as the ultimate Object of Worship. And if the Son be not the ultimate, but mediate Object only, I believe few can be so forsaken of their reason, as to affirm mediate Worship to be truly divine, or proper for the supreme Being to receive, who is the last End in all Worship and Service: and he who has no right to this, is not the supreme God.

So then since Mr. B. seems not to allow J. C. to be the ultimate Object of Worship, it will follow that he has only



only a subordinate or mediate Worship; and then I wonder to what purpose he went about to prove his supreme Deity from *divine* Worship being paid to him, when he must own, that none of his Instances from Scripture do prove him to be the *ultimate* or supreme Object of any such Worship, or to be *equal* to his Father, whose single Glory it is to be so. Thus in few words he subverts all his own Arguments, from that Topick of divine Worship, for none is such but ultimate Worship.

I find Mr. B. complains it was hard to understand this Argument of Mr. E's, p. 145. but he that sees what Reply he makes, will be apt to think the difficulty lay somewhere else, since he understands it far better than he answers it; by owning the *Father* to be the ultimate Object of Worship, leaving it to the Son only, to be an Object of *mediate* or inferior Worship, or of none at all.

*Arg. 3.* I argue from those grounds and reasons, on which the Scripture bottoms his Claim to Worship, which are such as will only support an *inferior* Worship. Dominion or Superiority is the ground of Homage and Worship, which is only an Expression of our Subjection to another in whose Power we are: Psal. 45. 11. *He is thy Lord, and worship thou him.* And from all *Subjects* some Homage is due. Now since the *Man J. C.* is undeniably possess'd of some Dominion over us; tho, absent and invisible, *he is exalted to be our Prince and Saviour*, Acts 5. 31. it is therefore most unreasonable to deny him all Homage or Worship, when he has such a Foundation for it. Angels have no Dominion over us that we know of, they are not our Lords, Lawgivers, or Judges, tho they may exercise their natural Powers for us; but *J. C.* as *Man* is our Judge and Lord, *Mat. 17. 31.* But yet since all the Dominion,

upon which the Gospel founds the Claim of his Worship, is but subordinate and delegated *from* and *for* another, *viz.* God or the *Father*, it follows also that the Worship claim'd cannot be supreme, as what is truly divine is.

Now that 'tis in regard of his subordinate deriv'd Dominion that he must be worship'd, those two Texts alledg'd, *Phil. 2. 9, 10, 11.* and *John 5. 22, 23.* are home-proofs, if taken in their fair native sense. But Mr. B. labours to make 'em unintelligible, by drawing an artificial, or rather a confus'd Cloud over their clear Light. *The Father has committed all judgment to the Son, that all should honour the Son as they do the Father; i. e.* as truly, not equally, as Dr. Whitby reports *Origen's* Interpretation to be. Is it not plain, that the Honour due to Christ (supposing it to be Worship rather than Obedience) is grounded on a delegated Authority, which he is invested with from the *Father*? Is not a commission'd Authority given him, on purpose to be the Warrant and Reason for our doing him Honour? which in all fair reasoning will imply, that without this Commission there wou'd not be so sufficient Warrant and Ground for it. And 'tis as evident, that this *given* Authority cou'd be no reason for giving him *divine* Worship, which is not due upon any thing that can be *given*; because 'tis due only to *original*, underiv'd, and independent infinite Perfections. And if *J. C.* had such underiv'd Excellencys, that had been a more noble ground of Honour, more worthy to be alledg'd in the Case; and withal, there had been no need of the *Father's* Gift, to procure his Son this Honour, if it was already antecedently due to him in the utmost degree, upon an infinitely *higher* Reason than this Gift. Nay the Reason proceeded on in the Text, is contradictory to a Claim founded on

*original*

original infinite Supremacy, because a Gift of Power cannot be made to him, who, as God, has all Power, and so must be both the Fountain of that Gift, and Receiver of it too. That same divine Nature cannot sure have all Power originally, or underiv'd, and then have that by Derivation, which it had underiv'd; he who has all originally, can receive no Gift or Addition. There can be no Truth more plain than this, nor any reasoning more natural and unstrain'd.

It were a most absurd Interpretation of the Text to make our Lord's meaning to be this, viz. The Father has committed all Judgment to my human Nature; that Men might honour my divine Nature, which yet receives nothing by it, and is adorable on a much higher reason without it. And yet there is no just doubt but that the same Subject is intended to be honour'd, which is invested with Authority from God, viz. the Son of Man, v. 27. Nor can a Gift or Dignity confer'd on the humane Nature be a ground of worshipping the divine at all; for as in Natural Water ascends not higher than the Fountain; so in Morals, our Actions ascend no higher in a regular Estimation than the Grounds and Principles of 'em. He who pretends to worship the divine Nature for a reason not in it, and which only reaches to the human, does not worship the divine at all, but only the human Nature.

Therefore to avoid these Absurdities, Mr. B. runs if possible into a greater. He cannot deny but that the Worship due to J. C. is founded upon the Father's Gift, in committing all Judgment to him; but then he would fain have this Gift to belong to his divine Nature; and because that must needs have all Power eternally inherent in it self, he says 'tis a Gift of no power but what did originally belong to it before, p. 88. And lest

one should not be able to see the mighty Bounty of the Father, in giving his Son nothing new, but only what he had without that Gift, he says the Gift lies in this, That the Father did devolve for a time the Sole exercise of this original Power on his Son, which originally was common to both (and I suppose to the Holy Spirit also) and, he says, that this is what Christ means when he says, All Power in Heaven and Earth is given me of the Father, p. 122.

Let us a little consider the Absurdity of these Notions in some Particulars.

1. Is it not strange, That in this Gift of the Father to the Son, of all Power, &c. which the Scripture speaks so pompously of, there should be nothing at all given him more than he had before? for Mr. B. expressly says, the Son acquires hereby no Authority that did not belong originally to his divine Nature, p. 88. A Gift of no new Authority seems to be a Gift of nothing: Is Christ rewarded with nothing, or with no addition of Glory? Must he hold that by Gift, which he held by a better Tenure before?

2. Is it not absurd to say, that God can have a Gift, or that God can be rewarded? Yet Mr. B. makes this Gift to be the Reward of the Son of God, i. e. the divine Nature, for becoming the Son of Man; and says, it terminates on the whole Person both God and Man. And shall it ever be said, that the supreme Possessor of all Perfection can be rewarded with a Gift of Authority, or receive any Commission? And tho Mr. B. would avoid this by the former Paradox, saying, That nothing is given but what he had originally, yet herein he is not very consistent either with Reason or himself; for since he calls the Son's sole Trust and Administration a Privilege, beyond his ruling in common with the Father, I would fain know



know whether he had that Privilege originally, or whether this was not a new Acquirement. He grants it to be new; so that it seems that as God Supreme, he can receive new Privilege, and become better and greater than he was before: Is this the Trinitarian Faith of God?

3. This is inconsistent with the Divine Unity, for one to resign, and another to receive the Administration; one to be voluntarily excluded, and the other solely entrusted: It agrees well enough with two Beings and two Wills, and with his Instance of K. William and Q. Mary, which is nothing to his purpose, unless he will make God and his Son to be a Pair of infinite Beings, which he denies, but yet his Reasonings do plainly insinuate it. The same single Will cannot resign and take; cannot both quit, and exercise the Administration of all: this implies two Parties and two Wills, as the different Subjects of that Power and mutual Consent, and Managers of those various Administrations.

4. It seems inconsistent with Mr. B. himself, who had said often that the Father sustains the place of supreme Lawgiver, p. 24. and intimates that the Son leaves the Rights of his Sovereignty in the Father's hands, and takes on him the Office of a Mediator, p. 26. If then J. C. have not finish'd his Mediation, as he has not, how can he be entrusted, or solely entrusted with the supreme Authority, while at the same time he has left the Rights of the Sovereignty with the Father? Or how has the Father devolv'd the sole Exercise upon the Son, if himself sustain the place of supreme Rector? Mr. B. says, that J. C. has this Sovereign Dominion over all, in the Capacity of Mediator, p. 25. And yet it seems in that Capacity he had left his Sovereignty in the Father's hands. So that the Father is suppos'd to have the Rights of Sovereignty devolv'd upon himself, at the same time

as he is pretended to have devolv'd 'em on his Son; and that while he is in the place of supreme Ruler, he has quitted the Rule to the Son. These things seem most repugnant to one another, as well as to Reason. And this is contrary to what the Trinitarians determine in their Systems; for there the Question, *An Christus solus jam dominetur in Ecclesia, non vero Pater?* is answer'd with a *negatur contra Soci-nianos*. Turret. Compend. p. 124.

5. 'Tis evident that this Authority, as given, is made the reason of the Son's Honour. Now if the Father's devolving the sole Exercise on the Son be the ground of Divine Worship or Honour, then while the Father has not this sole Exercise, nay has devolv'd his whole Right on another, hath he not quitted this ground of Divine Honour? And to say the Truth, Mr. B. makes the Father's Gift to lie in divesting himself of his Glory, so that he has left Rule than he had, and yet the Son has no more than before: This is to honour the Son, and not the Father, by supposing he has laid by the Grounds of Divine Worship, and conferring it only on his Son, himself quitting the Exercise of original Power.

6. This suppos'd Oeconomy of Mr. B. carries in it many injurious Reflections upon the Honour and Perfections of the blessed God.

It supposes that 'tis a Happiness for one Person to have all the Government in his hands, and to get the whole from the other two; so that it seems 'tis not so well for that one Person, when the Father has his part again: for this sole Exercise Mr. B. calls a Privilege, and therefore when the Son gives up his Kingdom, he resigns up a great Privilege of his Divine Nature, for to that Mr. B. supposes the Gift belongs.

We have sometimes been told, by one of Mr. B's Brethren, that Society in the Divine Nature is delicious, and

a great Happiness; and therefore there are necessary *Emanations* of several Persons. But then how comes it to pass, that Society in Government is so grievous, that it should be such a *Privilege* for one of 'em to have the others Rights confer'd on him?

Sure that Society should be as pleasing in Government, as in any thing else. And it should be best for the three Persons to rule alike, as they did before Christ's Reward, and must do hereafter; when, Mr. B. says, p. 33. *All will revert to the natural Order, and then Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, shall be jointly concern'd in the Administration of Government.* If this be their natural Order, methinks this should never be alter'd by a voluntary Dispensation, since the Divine Persons must be suppos'd to have all Advantages and Excellencies naturally, in the most perfect manner. It is unreasonable to suppose that J. C. can have this Power by any voluntary Gift, in a better manner than he had it originally, and by Nature; so as that it should be any Privilege to have their natural Order inverted.

Besides that 'tis no Privilege to the Son, who, as Mr. B. says, *has all Power originally*, to have it now as a Trust for which he must be accountable. Nay, it seems no Privilege any way to him, that the Father leaves the Administration to him, who had all before; any more than 'tis any Privilege to me, that another withdraws, and leaves me to have all the Sunshine to my self, who had it all before, as much as I can have by his retiring.

Upon the whole, I cannot but lament to see how woefully the holy Christian Religion is, by such invented Absurdities as these, expos'd to the grievous Scorn of Infidels; while they see such Schemes as this of Mr. B. (which indeed is the Ground of his whole Argument) representing God, his Son, and Spirit, not only as three

several Men for Distinction, but also as to their Temper and way of Management; making 'em to parcel out the Divine Regimen, and then one to devolve his part on the other, as the Son at first leaves his Rights with the Father (say the Trinitarians) and then to receive in his turn the others part for a Reward and Gift; and then to give it back again, as at the last day the Son must. As if like ambitious Mortals, who furiously scramble for Dominion, and labour to undermine each other, it were so among the three Persons of the Godhead, that one should count himself rais'd to Honour and Privilege, by the other's divesting himself, and leaving all to him. So that according to Mr. B's Scheme, one may plainly see that it were more for the Divine Glory and Happiness, that there were but one Person in God; since he would have all the Privilege of ruling all without a Sharer or Competitor, (which no doubt is the real Truth of all.) To such sad Derision do some bold Disposers of God Almighty expose him, as if they thought him (and had a mind to teach it to others that he is) like to themselves! Are these the venerable Mysteries of Christianity? Of which I find not one word in Holy Writ; and therefore they must answer for the Shame done to Christianity hereby, who have dared by such strain'd Artifices to distort and abuse Holy Scripture, that they may impose those violent Absurdities upon the Gospel.

I conclude then, that the Son of God being an inferior Being, is dignify'd by the Father as his Deputy, and so is honour'd subordinately by us; and then all Absurdities are avoided. Another, and an inferior Being, may easily receive from God, and have a dignifying Gift of Government; for the Exercise of which, I allow the Father of the Godhead in him does greatly enable



enable him. And thus it appears, that the *Authority* given for the Foundation of his Honour, is a *subordinate* Power vested in him as an inferior dependent Being, and subject to the *Father*; and consequently that the Worship resulting from it cannot be *Divine*, but inferior, whatever strain'd Evasions Mr. B. so unhappily advances.

Let me only add under this *Head*, that it will plainly appear to be only an inferior Worship that J. C. claims by that Text, *John* 5. 22, 23. from Mr. B's own Argument, which he brings to prove that the Devil claim'd no more than inferior Worship from him on the Mountain, *Mat.* 4. *Luke* 4. 6. says he, The Devil only claim'd *such inferior Respect as was due to one constituted a God over this lower World*, p. 134. or as one who had a Power over all the Kingdoms of it deliver'd to him, so that he could give it to whom he would. But how does he prove this? Why, 'tis merely from the Devil's saying, *All this Power is deliver'd to me*. Now if those Words will prove that the Devil did not demand more than inferior Worship, then I am pretty sure that our Lord J's words must prove the same of him, that he intended to claim only such inferior Honour, when he goes upon the same reason, *viz. because all Judgment was committed to him, or deliver'd to him; and withal he tells us from whom, viz. from the Father, which the Devil does not there own*. One may challenge Mr. B. to make his Argument good here, without being forc'd to grant that it will afford a good Argument, to prove that the Worship spoken of by J. C. in that Text is only inferior Worship; since his words do more fully express that, which Mr. B. in the Devil's case says, can only imply inferior Respect. Only whereas the Devil not only pretended to more Power than he had right to,

but had Impudence and Malice enough to demand what was unreasonable, even on that pretended Reason; our Lord J. on the contrary had a just Claim to his Dominion, and would seek no more Respect than is due to the Grounds on which he claims it. So that tho the Devil shou'd, and perhaps really did, require an unjust thing, and even vie with God himself; yet the Holy J. would never be guilty of it.

Having thus prov'd and clear'd this Point, *viz.* That J. C. is an Object of inferior Worship, and consequently that his being worship'd does not prove him to be the most High God; I proceed to vindicate it from Mr. B's Exceptions: tho as to what he objects against giving truly *Divine* Worship to him on the *Unitarian* Grounds, I need not take notice, because they deny such Worship; yet that on their Principles he may have inferior Religious Worship, I think I may easily justify against all his Objections, which may be reduc'd to Two.

1. He says, That it *entrenches on the peculiar Honour of God, to pay any kind of religious Worship to any Inhabitant of the invisible World, but himself*: Which is in effect to say it is idolatrous to worship the Man J. C. tho with inferior religious Homage.

2. That on the *Unitarian* Principles both *Papists* and *Pagans* may justify their Worship of Creatures, from any Charge of idolatry. These two Objections I hope fully to silence, as going upon mistaken grounds.

*First*, he says, it entrenches upon the incommunicable Honour of God, to worship any one else (even J. C. if not the supreme God) with any religious Worship, tho inferior. This I deny: And here he gives us a very lame Notion of Religious Worship, as oppos'd to *Civil*: By Religious Worship, says

says he, I understand such Worship as the Religion we profess directs us to pay to some Inhabitant of the invisible World. But why does he say to some Inhabitant of the invisible World, when he denies that our Religion directs us to pay Worship to any other of those Inhabitants, but God alone? So that he might more clearly have said, that he means such Worship as our Religion directs us to pay unto God. And if this be his Notion of Religious Worship, 'tis nothing to the purpose, to say that this is all of it appropriated to God; for Mr. B. never pretended any such Divine Worship to be given to any other, but only a different kind of subordinate Respect. But if Mr. B.'s meaning be, that there must be nothing of any external Semblance or Likeness in our very bodily Postures or Words, when we shew our Respects to Men, to what we use in our Worship of God; 'tis a very weak Assertion, contradicted by the allowed Examples of good Men, who have bowed their Bodies to Angels and Men too, much lower than now is used in the Worship of God. No difference may be perceiv'd in the outward Act, tho' there be enough manifest from the known difference of the Object, as Mr. B. himself confesses, p. 125.

Mr. B. had shown, that some such Worship (that is, such in the general Sound and Sense of the Letter) is ascrib'd to the Lamb slain, &c. the human Nature of Christ, Rev. 5. 13. as to God. The Words are the same, Blessing, Honour, Glory to the Lamb, and to him that sits on the Throne: And yet the Lamb standing among the Elders before the midst of the Throne, ver. 6. and God represented as sitting on the Throne of Majesty, made a sensible difference of the two Objects, enough to distinguish the nature of the Worship or Praise; as Mr. B. supposes in the Instance of the Peoples bowing their

Heads, and worshipping God and the King (David) 1 Chron. 19. 20. Mr. B. supposes the People first bow'd to God, and then faced about, and made another Bow to the King; but the Text takes no such care to make that distinction. And it may be another will think it as reasonable to say, The Angels first made their Acknowledgments to God on the Throne, and then did it again distinctly to the Lamb. However here was no danger of mistaking this latter for more than a subordinate Worship. And for his demanding what Instances [the Author can give of such Doxologies being ever apply'd to ordinary Men or the highest Angel; 'tis a poor and vain Flourish, when he knows the Unitarians give Honour to J. C. on grounds proper to him only, who alone is exalted to be Mediator and Head.

I come now directly to oppose his Assertion, by shewing that all Religious Worship is not appropriated to God alone, as his Peculiar. He affirms it to be so, both in the nature of the Worship, and by the Testimony of the Scriptures: I deny both.

First, 'Tis not so in the Nature of the thing it self; for all religious Worship is not Divine Worship (as Mr. B. asserts) nor does it suppose Infinite Perfections in its Object. Then indeed all Religious Worship of any but God, would be Idolatry, or supreme Worship given to an undue Object: whereas his great Friend Dr. Whitby allows that there is inferior Worship, which is Id. p. 230. not Idolatry, but Superstition only; because tho' it be religious Worship, yet it is not in its nature truly Divine. And indeed if there be such a thing as inferior Worship in its very Nature, it is so far from being appropriate to God, that it agrees not to him at all. He would be affronted by such mean Respects. But with Mr. B. there can be no such



thing as inferior, no religious Worship, which is not supreme and Divine. Let us examine his Reasons. *All such Worship, says he, supposes the Being to whom we pay it, to have such unlimited Perfections of Knowledge, Power, Presence, &c. as belong to none but God.* This I justly deny; for J. C. may have Knowledge and Power enough to answer my occasions, without being infinite therein. And Mr. B. can never make it out that this should be the reason, on which St. John's Worship was refus'd by the Angel, as injurious to God, to whom alone it was due, as he speaks, p. 140. Nor could this be the reason why J. G. refus'd to worship the Devil, when talking with him visibly, Luke 24. (which yet is the Text from which Mr. B. endeavours to prove his point, p. 133.) Will he pretend that the Angel could not hear St. John, nor do him any Office of Favour; nor the Devil know of Christ's Worship, without being suppos'd to have unlimited Perfections? Would not less than Omniscience and Omnipresence serve the turn? since it requir'd no more in them, than is in an ordinary Man to whom we speak or bow. Is this Divine Worship in the nature of it? Or any of that Idolatry, which, he says, is founded in the Nature of things, and not only on the Command, p. 129? So that he must find out some other reason, than from the Nature of the thing, before he can condemn all religious Worship given to another beside God, as idolatrous or sinful, from such Instances of Scripture: for on what reason soever the Angel discourag'd John, and J. C. the Devil, 'tis certain 'tis not on Mr. B's ground, as tho it suppos'd the Object to be of infinite Perfections; for his Instances make all against him and the reason he goes on, because they all relate to Persons present, which supposes no such Perfections in them to receive

Worship, as might be suppos'd in the Worship of one absent. Nay, I truly think, from St. John's Worship of the Angel, that it appears, there may be a religious Worship of an Inhabitant of Heaven, which is not Divine in its nature, nor idolatrous. Else if all such Worship be so, it makes St. John the Divine to be a grievous Idolater, and that twice: for Mr. B. supposes that he offer'd to the Angel what was appropriate to God, and to his injury, p. 126, 140, which he judges to be Idolatry. So then I don't see but St. John fell as grievously as Peter, who deny'd his Lord thrice, and the other committed Idolatry twice (if it was real matter of fact, but however it shews John's Inclination.) This is strange, that so long after he had receiv'd the Holy Ghost, and been a confirm'd ancient Apostle, he should not know what was Idolatry in the Nature of the thing, or by God's Command; nor yet perceive it, after he had been once warn'd by the Angel: I believe rather that he sin'd not so at all, as Mr. B. supposes, and that the Angel refus'd the Honour on another score; an Apostle being not much inferior, or unlike in Office to an Angel. The Angel's reason is, *I am thy Fellow-Servant, and of thy Brethren, that have the Testimony of Jesus.* Just so Peter refus'd the Honour from Cornelius, not because it was Divine, but says Mr. Baxter, it was unmeet for an *Paraphr. on* *bumble Man to own it.* Had Acts 10. 26. St. John thought the Angel refus'd it from the Sinfulness of the Act, he had never offer'd it so soon again, as Rev. 22.

And I may add, that if this Apostle did after the writing his Epistles, thus think that some religious Worship might be given to an Angel when present, then he never intended to forbid such Worship (consequently, not all Worship of others beside God) in his

his Caution, *Keep your selves from Idols*: tho' to worship Angels, when not present, may yet be inexcusable.

The like I argue from the Worship, which our Lord J. receiv'd when on Earth, as a Prophet. Mr. B. brings this as a Proof of his Deity, p. 126. If, says he, he were not truly God, he should in all reason have been as tender (as the Angel) of the Divine Honour, in refusing all external Acts that look'd like religious Homage.

Now Mr. B. must by this intend, that Christ receiv'd this on the account of his being God, and so as Divine Worship; else it cannot prove him to be God, by receiving it. I would then ask him whether this Worship was given by the Worshippers with any such intent: I believe he will not say they intended it otherwise than to worship him as a Prophet, and so as holy Messengers of God us'd to be reverenc'd: If not so, then it must have been Idolatry in them, to give God's Honour, or what in the Nature of the thing was Divine Worship, to one whom they judg'd not to be God. And would the blessed Jesus have been so little tender of the Divine Honour, as quietly to receive Idolatrous Worship, and not reprove 'em? We are told, that he rebuked the Young Man, who gave him only the Title of *Good Master*, while he did not judg him to be the most High God, *Mat. 19.* tho' the Trinitarians say he was really so *incognito*. If it were really so, then it is most strange that he could from time to time suffer Men to worship him (nay even the same Young Man) and yet shew no dislike. Was not giving him religious Worship (according to Mr. B.) a more direct and undoubted Proclamation of his Deity? And did it not more apparently carry with it an ascription of Divine Glory to him, than barely to say *Good Master*? Would he then have born it, to be made an *Idol* by them, by undue Worship? Be

sure he that refus'd the *Semblance* of a Divine Title, would much more have done the same by Divine Worship; tho' the Offerers no more intended it for such, than he who gave that Title did intend it for a Divine Attribute.

No, no, our Lord J. took it as the Worshippers gave it, viz. for an inferior religious Worship, or moral Reverence due to him, without any regard to his (suppos'd) Deity. Nay, if either J. C. or the Angel lookt on it as Divine Worship in its very Nature, how come they to be so calm? We find how such a Business rais'd the Indignation of Paul and Silas, *Acts 14. 13, 14, 15. They rent their Clothes, &c.* Had not J. C. nor the Angel any of this Tenderness for the Divine Honour? Or rather they had no such Provocation.

Thus I conceive Mr. B's Notion appears most false, in asserting all Religious Worship given to any Inhabitant of the invisible World, or to any other but God, to be Divine in its own nature. And tho' his Definition of religious Worship limits it to any other Inhabitant of the Invisible World, yet 'tis plain in his proofs, he extends the Case to all religious Worship of others also.

To bring the matter nearer, let us inquire whether his Argument will hold in reference to the Worship of such Inhabitants of the invisible World, as are absent from us; whether all Worship of any such, besides God, does in the nature of it ascribe infinite Perfection to its Object. This also I deny, because it is possible another beside God may know and do as much as such Worship may imply, tho' his Perfections be not equal to those of the Supreme Being. And this is what is really suppos'd in J. C. It does not necessarily suppose Infinite Omniscience to know (some way or other) all that passes in this little Spot of Earth.



It must be granted that J. C. as a Mediator of Worship, is as really supposed to know our Prayers and Wants, as when he is an Object of it (and I hope, that as Man he does mediate and intercede, and is our Agent) Dr. Whitby tells us, what is imply'd in being our Advocate with God: Speaking of the Romish Practice of praying to Angels and Saints, as Advocates for Men, he says, 'tis built on this Supposition, that they know our Prayers and Hopes; for, says he, *who knows not that to be our Idol. &c. Advocate, is to commend our Cause to God, and to intreat that our Desires be granted?* P. 180.

And who knows not that our Cause cannot be commended, nor our Desires represented, till they be first understood? Since then J. C. is our Advocate with the Father, and intreats for us, John 16. 26. Heb. 7. 25. it must be said, that he knows our case someway; and sure 'tis not in his Divine Nature he prays to the Father (supposing such an one.) Does the supreme Divine Nature pray to any? Or does God Almighty in one Mode intercede with himself in another? If then the Man J. C. does intreat for us, if he be our Advocate, and that for this end he is enter'd into Heaven, Heb. 9. 24. (which only can belong to his human Nature; for if he had a Divine one, that was as much there before) then in all reason, this Man J. C. must know our Case before he plead it, and in that same Nature which pleads it. God, who has exalted him to that Office, has some way or other capacitated him for it: and this is a sufficient ground for worshipping him as Mediator, tho it be far from implying him to be equal in Perfections to that God with whom he intercedes, and consequently is no ground for truly divine Worship.

To this forcible Argument Mr. B. seems at a loss what to answer, by his saying, p. 90. *That 'tis sufficient that the*

Divine Nature discerns our Distresses; and the Remembrance of his own Sufferings in our Nature, renders him a compassionate Intercessor. But what is this to the purpose? The Question is, how his human Nature can sympathize with, or intercede for us, without knowing all our Cases? To this he says, 'tis sufficient the Divine Nature knows. What! is this sufficient to make the human Nature know? Does not he say, that *this* was ignorant of what the Divine Nature knew, in the matter of the Judgment Day? So that 'tis no way sufficient, to say the Divine Nature knows all our Distresses, unless the Human know it also (which does not follow from the Divine Nature's knowing it) because to intercede is an Act of the human Nature and Understanding. Or does he mean, that 'tis sufficient to render the human Nature capable of Intercession, that the Divine Nature knows our Cases, tho it itself that must act in it, knows 'em not? This is to say, that the Man J. C. intercedes for he knows not *what*, nor *whom*; and is a compassionate Advocate in a Case he never heard of; and asks for he knows not what of his Father on their behalf, as not knowing what they need. Is this the encouraging Account, which the Scripture gives us of our compassionate High Priest? An Angel or Saint can intercede thus in general.

Therefore in the next words he is forc'd to suppose the Divine Nature may communicate to the Human the Knowledge of our particular Cases: And hopes to get off by adding, *That tho we should allow such Knowledge to be communicated to his human Nature, by Revelation from his divine, yet I don't see that this would prove an universal Knowledge, &c.* Now the allowing this Supposition, will serve Mr. B's purpose; for not to dispute, whether this Knowledge of all Christians particular Cases, may be call'd universal, since it extends to all,

all, and even implies the Knowledge of their *Hearts*, else little or nothing of their *Case* is truly known at all; nor whether this be not as much as the Scripture ascribes to J. C. yet I hope Mr. B. may see that this Knowledge by Revelation of our Cases in particular, is however enough for us to ground our Worship and Addresses upon, tho we do not suppose him *omniscient* or *omnipresent*, as God is. For what greater Knowledge, I wonder, does Prayer to him as Mediator suppose, than that he know our Cases and our Prayers? And if the *human Nature* may know this by Revelation, then the making him an *Object of Worship* does not imply him to be the *Supreme and Infinite God*, as Mr. B. pretends. Thus his Reason is utterly lost, by which he would prove the religious Worship of J. C. to be in its *Nature* truly divine, as implying infinite Divine Perfections; since without such Perfections, here is a way supposed by himself, in which he may be qualify'd to know our Addresses, as much as is needful for justifying us in offering them to him.

And whereas he refers us to Dr. Whitby for proof that the ancient Fathers, in the purest Ages, did disclaim all Religious Worship of any but God alone: I can make it appear, from that very Learned Doctor's own words (with what Consistency I heed not) that the chief of them, whom he instances in, did expressly deny at the same time, that ever they gave equal Honour to J. C. and to God his Father; and also that the Worship of Christ depended plainly on the Father's Grant of Honour to him: which, because the Pagan Demons could not justly pretend to, their Worship was for that very reason condemn'd by Christians. See his *Idolat. of the Rom. Ch.* p. 223.

2. Let us in the next place see if he can prove by Scripture Testimony, that all religious Worship is appropriate to

God, so as that no other can be capable of so much as inferior Worship. If Mr. B. can maintain this (tho he has certainly mistaken the ground on which such Worship is limited to God only, it not being so in its *Nature*, yet) this shall be enough to decide the Cause with me, who desire to walk exactly by the Scripture Rule, and only reject those *Trinitarian* Opinions, which I think the Gospel never asserts; but magisterial Men would shew their *Dominion* over our Faith, in imposing 'em upon us.

The Proof from Scripture] (besides such Instances of Peter's refusing the Worship of *Cornelius*, and the Angel that of *John*, the Vanity and Weakness of which I have already shewn) that he insists on, is our Lord's Reply to Satan, Luke 4. 10. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* Whence Mr. B. concludes, that our Saviour has determin'd it, that no religious Worship is to be given to any but God; and he adds, p. 134. 'That the Devil did not claim divine Worship, but such an inferior Respect which was due to one constituted a God over this lower World; yea, a relative Worship, which ultimately refer'd to the Honour of the Giver, Luke 4. 6. But, adds he, our Saviour rejects his Demand, not by denying the Devil's pretence to such Power, but by telling him he demanded what was God's incommunicable Right, and what he could not claim, had his Pretensions been never so true. And that J. C. gave a weak Answer, and the Devil was a weaker Disputant to take it, if that Text only deny'd *supreme Worship* to be given to any other than God, and not all Worship.

Here he thinks he has gain'd the Victory, and is ready to triumph; but may receive some check, if he consider how weak the Foundations of his Arguments are. For,



1. It cannot be deny'd, that the Precept related by Christ is not to be taken under some Limitation; and that it does not forbid *all manner of Worship* or Homage whatever, to other than God. For then no Homage might be paid to any Prince or Parent, which is Civil Worship, yea and religious too, as 'tis given on a religious account, from Conscience toward God, and reverence to his Image and Authority, which Magistrates bear: nor would J. C. have receiv'd this Worship of Prostration (for that was all that was in dispute) from such as respected him only as a Prophet, if it was not lawful to give to any but God such religious Homage. Besides 'tis plain, the Jews never thought Prostration to a Man, nor to an Angel, to be against this Law: and since the Devil requires, and Christ pleads against bare Prostration, or only falling down before him, it follows that it is lawful to bow or fall prostrate before any other than God, viz. Man or Angel, then it is certain J. C. did not mean, by repeating this Command, to forbid this very Act of Worship to all others but God; which yet it did forbid to the Devil. It was a reason against worshipping him, on some special ground, which might not reach to all others, to whom it may be allow'd to fall down, and do homage, as to superior Powers in subordination to God: or else it must relate only to supreme Divine Homage and Adoration, and not to all inferior Worship.

2. Well then, since Mr. B. cannot say that all Prostration to another but God is here forbidden, it is requisite that we inquire what sort of Worship the Devil might intend by it, and which our Lord intimates to have been forbidden in that Law which he cites; that so we may see what Limitations are to be given to it.

Mr. B. says, that we are to understand it of all Religious Worship, which

is only to be given to God: but I say that we may as well limit it to *supreme* or ultimate religious Worship; and that on due Consideration it will be found, that either the Devil requir'd Divine, or at least absolute ultimate Worship, or else but Civil Worship; and consequently that Christ in shewing the Unlawfulness of that Worship which he requir'd, did only prohibit such Worship. For 'tis plain to me, that the Devil did not claim an inferior subordinate Worship, as Mr. B. pretends; since by such religious Worship is always, I think, understood a serious reverential Respect to Persons for their moral Excellencies, or their Sanctity; and near Relation to God. Now I wonder, what pretence Mr. B. thinks the Devil had to this moral religious Reverence: Did he set up for a Saint, or a Prophet of God, or pretend to any sacred spiritual Office in the Church, or in Heaven under God; or demand Worship that might be ultimately refer'd to God? No, he never pretends any such thing. Therefore,

3. It was either a sort of Civil Homage, or ultimate inferior Respect, or supreme Divine Worship, that he sought. Let it not seem strange, that I say it might be Civil Homage; for do but observe how the Devil states his Claim: He represents himself as a mighty puissant Prince of spacious Dominions, who had great Offices, Preferments, and Kingdoms to bestow on his Favourites; and on this account he demands Homage of Christ, by falling down to worship him, as the Eastern People used to worship their Kings. This seems plainly to be a doing homage to him, as a secular Prince, or God of this World. Had the Devil sought to be worship'd when absent, or in some Idol Temple, it might have lookt more like religious Worship; but he only seeks Worship when present, and making a pompous shew of his Gran-

Grandeunt: I think this looks very like Civil Worship.

But if Mr. B. will have it to be inferior religious Worship, then I say it was at least *ultimate Worship*, such as no way was in Subordination or Reference to God, on whom all Worship ought to terminate ultimately, or 'tis sinful. For the Devil sets up in opposition, not subordination to God, and was so consider'd by our Lord Jesus; and I utterly deny that he ever pretended to such Worship as *should ultimately refer to God as the Giver*. For he never says one word, that God was the Giver of his Dominion, or had constituted him a God over the World, as Mr. B. pretends. Much less do I believe, (supposing J. C. had so understood him) that our Lord did not in his Answer intend to deny such a false Pretence. To suppose the Devil has a subordinate Dominion under God, relative to him as the Giver, is to suppose an orderly Agreement between God and the Devil: But *what Communion has Light with Darkness? What Fellowship hath Righteousness with Unrighteousness?* Our Lord must never be suppos'd not to have deny'd this, in his Answer: Nor does he any way insinuate, that had this Pretence of a just subordinate Authority been true, yet no Homage could be given him in Subordination to God, without intrenching on God's incommunicable Right. All this is unwarrantably feign'd by Mr. B. and not express'd or imply'd in Christ's words. His Answer was, *Thou shalt worship God: qu. d. I am bound by this Law to do homage to the God of Israel, and therefore must not do it to thee his avowed Enemy, which would be a Breach of my Allegiance to God. And only him shalt thou serve; i. e. I must be under no Government but his, and therefore I will not own thine, which would be a Revolt from him whose Subject I am.* I think this is a very

fair and natural Sense of his words; of *Thou, qu. d.* All Worship must ultimately relate to God, who is the only Fountain of Honour and Power, and he only must be the end of all Worship. Therefore I'll give no Homage of which he cannot be the End, and in which he is not acknowledg'd nor honour'd.

Now supposing this to be the Case, then the words, *Thou shalt worship the Lord, and him only shalt serve*, are only spoken in opposition to Enemies, and will only exclude from Worship, or all sort of Homage, any Usurper and Opposer of God, that has no Authority from him, and whose Worship can have no relation to him at all: so that there is good Consequence in this, *Thou shalt worship God only*, as the ultimate Object of all Worship and Honour; and therefore thou shalt not do homage to his Enemy and Rival, because tho' in other subordinate Worship, God is *relatively* and ultimately worship'd in the Worship of his authoriz'd Substitute, yet this Worship of a declar'd Enemy, has no relation to him, and can no way be reduc'd to this Head of worshipping God, as the other may. He that *honours the Son* or Servant, honours him who sent him; but so does not he, who does honour to an open Foe; and therefore Christ rejects it, by proving that we *must worship and serve God*, which is all that the Text cited by him says, *Deut. 6. 13.* (tho' the *Septuagint* had added the word *only* afterwards, which the Evangelist in gross repeats) for the Obligation to serve God as his Subjects, is reason enough upon which to refuse doing homage to an Enemy. And indeed our Lord does not say, *him only shalt thou worship*, but *him only shalt thou serve*; teaching us that there the stress of the *Contest* lay, and that what the Devil requir'd was not so much a sacred devout *Adoration*, as a doing *Service* to him as a Subject, or owning his Government,



vernment, and Dominion, as God of the World, by a Token of Subjection that was common in the World; whereas we must only serve God, i. e. ultimately, whether immediately or relatively; and therefore may not perform Homage to his Adversary, as Christ teaches us: since there is no just Power, but that which is from God, not what is opposite to him.

4. Yet I must confess, that when I look into *Deut. 6, 13, 14.* whence the words of Christ are said to be taken, the Context seems to intimate, that the Precept refers to *divine Worship*, because the words following are, *Thou shalt not go after other Gods, the Gods of the People*; and then 'tis no wonder if Christ refused the Devil *divine Worship*, upon the Warrant of this Text, teaching us to do the same, when yet some inferior Worship may be due to himself as one under God. Nor do I see any weight in Mr. B's Objection, viz. That the Devil could not demand such *supreme Worship*, since we know he has always proudly and wickedly aspir'd to rival God, and to be in the place of the most High; and tho his saying, *All this is deliver'd to me*, may seem to imply his owning a superior Power, which makes his Claim to *supreme Honour* very unreasonable; yet who need wonders if the Devil desires an unreasonable thing? Mr. B. seems to rely too much upon the Devil's *Modesty* in this matter, which I am very prone to call in question; and I doubt it will puzzle Mr. B. to vindicate it in another respect, in this very Affair of Christ's Temptation: for since the Gospel tells us, the Devils knew who *J. 6. max, Mark 1, 24.* compar'd with *ver. 34.* what an unaccountable thing was it in them to go about to tempt *J. C.* to sin, if indeed they knew him to be their infinite God? Could they be so foolish as to think to overcome and

baffle God? Nay could they be so foolish as to hope to entice God to worship the Devil, tho with inferior Worship? This Mr. B. supposes without difficulty, and cannot he then suppose the Devil to be so unreasonable as to demand more than his real due? Nay let me say, that to tempt God to sin, was a foolish impossible Attempt, that could not satisfy the Devil; and therefore some will conclude, that tho they knew him indeed, yet they knew him not to be God, else they had not done so foolish a thing. But as to such an unreasonable Demand of *supreme Worship*, tho it was unjust (and not at all the more unlikely for that) yet it might be deem'd possible, and very gratifying to his Pride, and therefore 'tis not strange if he sought it without Reason or Modesty.

And as for the Phrase of *All being deliver'd to him*, it may possibly denote only the Effect, that he had it in possession, rather than the manner of his gaining it; for he mentions no Author or Giver, nor takes the least notice of receiving it from God: so that he rather intends by that Expression, that the Kingdoms of the World had deliver'd or yielded themselves into his Hand as their Ruler; of which he pretends an absolute independent Power to dispose, as he pleases, to whom he will.

So that Mr. B. grounds his Argument against the Devil's claiming *divine Worship* from Christ, on a weak surmise; for the Devil seems far from intending a *relative Worship*, that should ultimately refer to God the Giver, as he pretends. And (as was already hinted) I say again, that if the Devil's owning that all was deliver'd to him from God (supposing that) will prove that he could not justly (tho he might nevertheless unreasonably) claim *divine Worship*; then it is very evident on the same ground that

that when J. C. owns all his Authority was given him, and that by his Father expressly, neither could he claim such Worship on that ground, John 5. 22, 23. But if J. C. might yet require divine Worship, notwithstanding such Expressions, then Mr. B. has no reason to suppose it inconsistent with the Devil's Claim to the same. This seems unanswerable by Mr. B. who supposes divine Adoration to be requir'd for J. C. in that Text, tho' against Reason.

If it be said, how could the Devil pretend to supreme Worship, if not to subordinate religious Worship? I answer, both are unreasonable, but yet he does certainly aspire to that supreme or absolute Dominion, which is a foundation of the former, but never to that Sanctity of Person or Office, which is the ground of the latter.

So then if the Devil did aspire at supreme or absolute Worship, then our Lord's denying that to him, or any but God, is no Argument against the lawfulness of inferior religious Worship to another than God; and the reason which he went on, imply'd in the Command, will not relate necessarily to any See Limb. Body Worship, but that of Divinity, 2d. which he applys it vol. in Engl. p. to there. Therefore we may rest content with Mr. Baxter's judicious and wary Comment on the Text, who says, that the words *him* [only] *thou shalt serve*, excludes other Gods, and all Competitors and Opposers, but not others subordinate to God. To worship the Devil in competition with God, if he sought divine Worship; or in opposition to, or independently on him (as all Homage done to an open Enemy is) tho' it were by inferior Homage, is against the Text and Precept, which makes God alone the Object of Supreme, and the

ultimate Object of all Worship whatever.

And thus Dr. Owen himself against Mr. Biddle, p. 146. says, Where it is said, God only is to be worship'd, tho' it do not exclude all others from any kind of Worship, but that they may have what is due to them by God's Appointment, from their Excellence and Preheminence, yet it does absolutely exclude any from being worship'd with divine Worship.

After all the rest, I might answer in short, that if the words cited by our Lord were pretended to prohibit all religious Worship whatsoever of any besides God, yet it was a more positive Command, and might be necessary, when God had not as yet exalted a Mediator: For this was before he had given J. C. a Name above every Name, to which all are to bow, as a Reward of his Sufferings. But now that God has made him both Lord and Christ, Acts 2. 36. he has by a new Law requir'd, that we honour and do Homage not only to God, but to his only beloved Son also; for every new Dominion and Authority requires a suitable Homage and Honour from all under it.

And yet here is nothing contradictory to the first Command in all this; for this is not to set up another infinite God, or to make any other Person God, but the one Self-existent He; 'tis only an acknowledgment of his Minister and Son, for we have one God, and one Lord besides, Eph. 4. The Unitarians are so far from denying the Morality of that first Command, that they are zealously tenacious of it, and think it the very Basis of their Cause, and a standing Reproach to their Adversarys. And indeed all the Trinitarians have clearly prov'd the Repeal of that Command, 'tis judg'd they will never reconcile their setting up three distinct Persons, as Objects of divine Worship (one an unoriginate God, and two other dependent deri-



vative) with the Command, of having no other God but (one single) me: while the Unitarians read this, that only one single Person is to be accounted for their God. They can never hearken to them, who instead of no other God but me, would interpret the Command thus, Thou shalt have no other God but us Three, or none but Me, Me, and Me, including three Me's in the one.

Thus it appears, that the Unitarians are far from robbing J. C. of his due, if no divine Worship was ever claim'd by him; and as far from encroaching on the divine Honour, by giving God's Peculiar to one who is not God; since they give him that inferior Worship only, which does not belong to the Supreme, but is allow'd by him to his commission'd Son. But they seem to rob God of his Glory, who give divine Worship to another than him, and rob Jesus Christ too, forbidding that subordinate Worship of him, which is granted to him of the Father: What he requires they deny, and what he never claims they pretend to bestow upon him.

However, I think it may be undeniably prov'd, that the Trinitarians have incur'd this Guilt of giving God's Glory to another, which the Unitarians can vindicate themselves from, in another respect, and that is, in worshipping the human Nature of Christ, which is as much a Creature as any other Man, let what Union you will be pretended. And yet those ancient Christian Fathers, who are oft cited as pleading for the Worship of God only (whence some infer they held Christ for that God, because they worship'd him) did nevertheless admit this other Object of Worship. And he who can reconcile their Worship of the human Nature of Christ with that Maxim, that God only is to be worship'd (with any sort of religious Worship, as Dr. Whithy and Mr. B. take it to mean) may easily be-

lieve that the Unitarians can reconcile their Worship of J. C. with the same Maxim. If the Trinitarians could worship the Humanity because related to the Divinity, why may not others also worship a Man inhabited by it, tho not by personal Union? It is as much a Creature in the one case as the other.

Several learned Men have shewn the common Judgment of the Fathers to be for worshipping the Humanity, as united to the Divinity (among whom I find Athanasius for one) and this was particularly manifested in their Exposition of that Text, Psal. 99. 5. which they read thus, Worship ye his Footstool (meaning, probably, the Ark.) Those Trinitarian Fathers were puzzled at this, because they judg'd it absurd to worship such an Object as the Letter of the Text contain'd. To avoid this, they ran into this figurative Interpretation of the words, saying, that by this Footstool was to be understood the human Nature of Christ, and this they thought might be ador'd. Their Agreement in this point may be seen, in *Forbesii Instru. Theol.* l. 7. c. 37. and Dr. *Stillingfleet's Defence against Godden*, Par. 2 p. 714. The former of these two learned Men scruples not to say of J. C. *Adorandus, inquam, sine exclusione carnis, ab objecto seu termino adorationis.* And he ends the Chapter with this Conclusion drawn from the Opinion and Judgment of the Fathers: *Unica & sola ratio, propter quam humanitas Christi, latria, soli Deo debita, absq; Idololatria crimine a nobis colitur, est unio hypostatica: i. e. The only reason why we worship the human Nature of Christ, with that Worship which is due to God alone (and yet without Idolatry) is the personal Union to the Divinity.* Thus it appears, Christ's human Nature has been us'd to be worship'd without any Outcry against the Idolatry of it. The like is asserted by Dr. *Owen* (*Person of Christ,*

Christ, p. 308. and 322.) *The human Nature*, says he, *in the Person of the divine, and together with it, is the Object of all divine Adoration, and no other Creature.*

I ask Mr. B. whether these Men be not *Idolaters*, as all the *Lutherans* also? and whether this has not been the common Doctrine of the *Trinitarians*, whatever the straits to which they are now driven, may make them profess or turn to?

See *Turretine* on the Question, *An Christus qua Mediator sit adorandus?* who owns that the affirmative (i. e. the Worship of Christ as Mediator) had been admitted as a Problem among the *Orthodox*; but now seeing the advantage the *Socinians* made of that, he gravely intimates, they should be very cautious in allowing it. *Licet hac questio prout inter Orthodoxos agitur problematica sit, tamen alienius momenti esse, post detectas Socinianorum Insidias, proclivius est intelligere.* Hain they would throw off the Worship of Christ as Mediator, rather than the *Unitarians* should pinch them so hard with it; for they who worship him as Mediator, worship the created *Humanity* along with the *Divinity*, according to them.

Now is not this, even according to the *Trinitarian* Principles about *Idolatry*, more manifest *Idolatry*, than any that can be pretended to be charg'd on the *Socinians*? For these profess to give only an inferior Worship, as to an inferior Being, which they think the Gospel warrants: but the *Trinitarians* profess Christ's human Nature to be but a *Creature*, and yet at the same time they profess to give it divine Worship designedly; whilst they deny religious inferior Worship it should be paid to anything but God, and accuse it of *Idolatry*. Can any thing be more absurd than this?

I wonder much if *Arius* found any

difficulty to be quit with such Fathers as *Athanasius*, who charg'd him with *Idolatry* for worshipping *J. C.* with inferior Worship (for it could be no more in their Design) whom they judg'd to be but a *Creature*; when themselves could stretch their Devotion, so as to extend divine Worship to the same *Creature* (of which they had much meaner Thoughts) in the same Act with which they ador'd the divine Nature. I wonder with what shew of reason this can be vindicated from the Crime of the grossest *Idolatry*, to worship a profess'd *Creature* with divine Worship? It is a vain thing to think to excuse themselves, by saying, they do not worship the *Humanity* for it self, but as and because it is united to the *Divinity*: Since as that Union does not change the human Nature into a divine Nature; so neither does it hinder their Worship from being *Creature-Worship*. And if it be *Idolatry* to give divine Worship to a *Creature*, then for any to offer a reason why they do so, is only to offer a reason why they commit *Idolatry*, instead of a Proof that 'tis not such. Thus they worship a *Creature* and a *Man* (that is, according to them, they commit *Idolatry*) because it is united to the *Divinity*.

Thus I have vindicated the giving inferior religious Worship to *J. C.* on *Unitarian* Principles, from being any way injurious to the Honour of God; either from the Nature of the thing, or from any positive Law against it reveal'd in Scripture. Nay 'tis to the Glory of the Father, to have his Son honour'd in a Subordination to him. There are two other Texts which Mr. B. mentions, to prove it to be *Idolatry* to pay any religious Worship to any other besides God, viz. *Rom. i. 25.* and *Gal. 4. 8.* But to these I shall have a proper occasion to speak in answer to Mr. B's

See n<sup>o</sup>



*Second Argument against giving religious Worship to J. C. on the Unitarian Principles, viz. That this would clear Pagans and Papists from the Charge of Idolatry.*

In answer to which, I shall shew that the Worship of J. C. as *Mediator*, on the Unitarian grounds, does no way excuse the Pagans from the Guilt of Idolatry charged on them in the Scriptures; nor yet the Papists so far as they agree with them. Mr. B. supposes that the Heathens could no way be guilty of Idolatry, by their worshipping Creatures, unless all religious Worship, to any besides God be so. To make out this, he supposes two things, both of them very false.

*First*, That all Idolatry is founded not on the bare Command of God, but on the Nature of the thing.

*Secondly*, That the Pagans did not intend to worship any of their Idols with *divine* Worship, but only with inferior Worship; and seems to think that if they are cleared from Idolatry in their giving inferior Worship, they are wholly freed, since they gave no other. But,

I deny that all Idolatry is (tho some may be) founded on the Nature of the *act*, or that it ascribes infinite Perfections to the *Object*; and so respects it as God: for in some Instances it depends on the mere *positive* Will of God.

To prove this, I shall shew from some Instances in Scripture, that there has been Idolatry, which in the bare nature of the thing did not ascribe infinite or *divine* Perfections to its *Object*. I am satisfy'd that a great part of the Idolatry of the World has been, not about the *last* Object, but about the *Medium* of Worship; and that when they never ascrib'd any thing to it, which in the nature of it was *truly* divine, or God's incommunicable Right, which Mr. B. supposes all Idolatry does.

The second Command is esteem'd by Protestants to be the great bar to Idolatry in the Worship of Images; and they have fully shewn, that in

Scripture the Worship of an Image is arraign'd as Idolatry. Now Mr. B.

will not allow the Pagans to be so senseless, as to take their Images for *real* Gods, or to worship them as such;

which deserv'd the *Jews* visitation. It is evident, the *Jews* did not worship the Golden Calf, but as a Symbol of the

divine Presence, even that of the true *Jehovah*, Exod. 32. 4, 5. and yet it was gross Idolatry, and so call'd, *Nach*

*by the Jews. They made a Calf, and sacrific'd upon it.* Yet I am persuaded there was nothing in this, that appears to

be Idolatry in the nature of the thing, as this imports the ascribing divine Perfections to another than God: for

to make an Image, and set it up as a symbolical Place of the divine Presence, for God to dwell and operate

in, is not to ascribe any infinite Perfection to it; because any material thing may be put to such an use, if

God please; and the Sacrifices offer'd thereto, or rather *at* them, are not offer'd to them design'dly, but to God

suppos'd to reside in them. And indeed the Mercy-Seat and Ark, under the Jewish Law, was a material Sym-

bol of God's Presence, before which the Sacrifice was presented, and the Blood was sprinkled upon it for Atonement, Lev. 16. and Incense burnt be-

fore it; and yet this was not Idolatry in the nature of the thing, for then it had ever been sinful. Tho, I doubt,

it had been Idolatry for the *Jews* to put the Golden Calf, or any Symbol of their own Appointment, to that

sacred use; and to design the divine Presence and Operations to it, and to present their Sacrifices *at* it, to burn Incense before it, and sprinkle

it with the Blood of a Sacrifice. Not but that the Golden Calf, in its own nature, had been as capable of the

Shechina

*Stechin* is the other; but because God himself appointed the one, and not the other: so that it could only be Idolatry, from the mere positive Will of God; which could make it to be so, or not, at his arbitrary Pleasure; but in no case did it suppose infinite Perfections to be ascribed to the Symbol or Image; since the same thing was done, whether it was an appointed Symbol, as was the *Mercy-Seat*, or a forbidden one, as was the *Calf*.

Nor is the Reason, of its being Idolatry to offer Worship to such a Medium or Symbol, to be taken hence, viz. because there was no Deity did reside there, and so the Worship rested on the Symbol or Image, which was intended for the Deity supposed to be in it. For he who truly intends to worship the true God, as did the *Israelites*, are sure to find him every where; and that as an Object of Worship, whether there be Symbol used or not; so that it can never fall beside him, unless he reject it, which depends on his Pleasure, and not on the nature of the thing always.

Again, supposing God to set up an inferior Being (and that *J. C.* be He) as the common Mediator, to be the Advocate, or the great Master of Requests in the heavenly Court, to appear for us there; would not it be as manifest Idolatry to pay the respect due to his Office alone, to another of our own setting up, as to set up of our own head a *symbolical Medium* of divine Worship, or a graven Image? As he who sets up a *Vice-Roy* in any Province, and applies to and acts under his Authority as such, when the Sovereign Prince has made another so by his Commission, may be as truly guilty of *Treason*, as he who sets up another Sovereign; tho the Viceroy be far below his Sovereign Prince, and all the Honour paid him be far below what is due to his chief Lord, and is peculiar to him. For tho the

Honour paid to an usurping Deputy or Viceroy be not what the chief Sovereign ever appropriated to himself as incommunicable; yet it is his incommunicable Right and Prerogative to appoint who shall be so honour'd. Even so, tho it be not God's incommunicable due to be worship'd with inferior Worship; yet it is his due to appoint who shall be his Mediator, and have that respect: and therefore to give that Honour to another of our own establishing, is to intrench, tho not directly on his Worship, yet on his Authority in appointing the Object of subordinate Worship; and this is either Idolatry or Rebellion; or both, in misapplying religious Worship, peculiar to the Mediator, to another self-devised Object. And of this the Pagans were guilty, even while the Unitarians are excus'd, by respecting only the *H. J.* whom the Father hath seal'd, and set apart for that high and principal Office, in which none must rival him.

Further, I think Mr. B. cannot deny in some Instances, that Idolatry is merely from the positive Command of God; for since he accounts all religious Worship of Angels to be Idolatry, or a giving God's incommunicable due to them, I demand what there can be in the nature of the Act, that looks like the giving God's due to them in this Instance (something like to which Mr. Baxter supposes in his *Directory*.) Suppose any Christian Assembly (in which we learn that the Angels are present, *1 Cor. 11. 10.*) should pray indefinitely and generally to such Angels as are there to hear 'em, for what is in their Power to afford; is here any more ascrib'd to them, than we ascribe to an ordinary Man, of whom we ask an Alms? If it be Idolatry, 'tis not so from the nature of the thing. Had God bid me pray to Angels, I would take it for my Honour, says Mr. Baxter, in his *Dying Thoughts*. p.



155. It seems he did not take it to be Idolatry in the nature of the thing.

2. I deny that the *Pagans* did only give inferior Worship to their Idols or *Demons*; for as they worship'd other Idols besides their *Demons*, viz. the visible Creatures, the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Host of Heaven*, and several others, whom they plac'd in the room of the true and supreme God (which is the Idolatry so often charg'd upon them in Scripture, *Josh. 24. 14, 15, 16.* and not always *Demon-worship*) so the Worship which they did give to their *Demons*, was as great as any they gave to the Supreme, viz. all manner of Sacrifices. Nor do I doubt but the vulgar People were wholly taken up with them, and minded no other Gods but the *Demons* that inhabited their Images, as they suppos'd; they worship'd the *Creature*, passing by the *Creator*, *Rom. 1. 25.* as *Beza* renders it. They terminated all their Worship in the *Demons*, and so gave truly divine or absolute Worship to them, for which they were charg'd with Idolatry. Nor is it of any force to tell us, that some of their subtle Philosophers reputed them only for *Dii inferioris notæ*, or subordinate Gods constituted by the Supreme, and worship'd on the account of the Power he had invested them with, &c. for we know the *Vulgar* do not refine, as a few speculative *Students* may do (as is apparent among the *Papists*, the *Vulgar* of whom have gross thoughts of Images, &c. which the nice Scholars quite disown.) This is plain in the Case of their *Image-worship*. Mr. B. may tell us, that the *Pagans* were not so senseless as to take the *Stocks*, and *Stones* for true Gods, and that they did not worship them, but the imaginary Deity dwelling in them: for this is what some of their learned Apologists tell us, as we find in *Arnobius* and others. But yet 'tis plain, that the Prophets charge the People even with the Worship of the

Idols or Images themselves; and tho' it was a sottish absurd thing, yet that is the very Argument they use in their Reproofs, and reproach 'em for being so brutish: *Psal. 115. They that make them are like unto them, and so is every one who trusts in them.* *Hab. 2. 19.* he saith, *To the dumb Stone arise.* See but how the Prophet derides them, *Isa. 44. v. 11.* to the 20th, that they should be so stupid, as to think by hammering and hewing it, to make a God of one part of the same Tree as they had burnt in the Fire, and roasted their Meat with; and that they should worship and pray to it: and he says, *They could not see, they had no Understanding, not so much sense, left as to say, I have burnt part in the Fire, and shall I make of the residue a God, shall I fall down to the Stock of the Tree?* The more monstrous and brutish a thing this was, the more likely it is to be what they are charg'd with; for the Prophet expressly says of 'em, they were brutish herein, *Jer. 10. 14.* If they had such fine Speculations and Evasions, they could easily have wip'd off all this Reproach, and it had not been just to impute such ridiculous things to them, but to have answer'd their plausible Pretences as to an indwelling Deity. Thus *Origen* says, *The Multitude can't bear to bear any one deny those to be Gods, whom they have been wont to worship.* *Cont. Cels. p. 376.*

Much more were they like to terminate their chief Worship in those *Demons* or Spirits, which they suppos'd to preside over those Images, (tho' the Learned took them for no more than inferior Ministers of God) and thus there was Idolatry in their *Demon-worship*, in that they gave supreme Worship to them; which has nothing parallel to the *Unitarian* Case.

Nay, tho' the Scripture takes no notice of their making any such distinction in their Practice, as to this inferior

ferior relative Worship, which Mr. B. supposes was all that the Pagans gave; yet allowing that they did so, and that this Worship was condemn'd too (as it must be) yet it may be it was so, as it intrench'd on God's Honour, and peculiar Right to appoint Mediators. He can never shew that there was any thing in that subordinate Worship, which in its own Nature ascrib'd infinite Perfections to those *Demons*. And then since *J. C.* is authoriz'd to be our Mediator, the *Unitarians* are free from such Injury to God's Honour, as the Pagans were guilty of in setting up Mediators of their own.

But, says Mr. B. p. 137. if this was the reason of the Heathens' Crime, that they worship'd uncommission'd *Heró's*, then the Apostle should have fix'd his Charge here, on their doing it without Command and Warrant from God, and not have made it their Crime to worship the Creature beside the Creator, and to serve such as by Nature are no Gods; since the Heathens might have resorted on the Apostles, that they also worship'd a Creature, and a God by Office, &c.

To this I answer, That it is a vain Supposition in Mr. B. that the Apostles should answer all the particular Cavils and Evasions of a few learned Adversariys among the Pagans, when they were reproving the current vulgar Errors only. The sacred Writers are never wont to do thus, but content themselves with condemning the vulgar Errors, without considering the nice Apologies of some that refin'd their Notions by subtle Speculations, while the common People ran into grosser Notions; against whom the sacred Censures are utter'd, rather than against the subtle few, who durst neither profess their more refin'd Thoughts, nor yet go about to hinder the common Worship of their Idols; but join'd with them in it, tho they saw them worship'd with the

highest Worship by the People, whom they judg'd to be but inferior Gods (as is now among the Papists.) So that if the common People generally worship'd their Images and Demons as Gods, this was ground enough for the Apostles to condemn them, whatever a few undiscover'd Philosophers might think to say for their own particular Excuse.

That I say not this without reason, may appear from a clear Instance: 'Tis evident, as was said, that the Prophets very often reproach the Heathens for worshipping Stocks and Stones, their Idols or Images, and even scoff at them for a Company of Fools; yet Mr. B. knows that the Pagan Writers reply to this Charge, in their Defence against Christians, That they were no such Fools as to take the Images for Gods; or to pay their Worship to Wood and Stones: no, it was only to the indwelling Deitys, who took up their Habitation, and operated in those Images, &c. with many more fine things of this kind, which are so well known to the Learned, that they will not require particular Testimonys: See *Lactant. l. 2. c. 2. Arnob. l. 6. Euseb. Prep. l. 4. Aug. de Civit. l. 8. c. 23, 24.* Now according to Mr. B's arguing, one must say, The Prophets cannot be justify'd in their Charge against these Pagans, because they take no notice of these Replies and Evasions, which plainly overturn a great deal of the grounds of that Charge. They should have fixt their Charge on this, that there were no such Spirits or Demons that did indeed dwell there, or that could claim any such Worship if they did; and not have made it their Crime to worship Wood and Stone, which it seems they did not do only as Mediums of Worship, or as the Seats of their Gods. Nay they might have retorted on the Prophets, How come you to reproach us as Fools for worshipping Wood and Stones? Do



we do more than you *Jews*? Have not you an Habitation of Wood and Stones for your God, towards which you pray and worship? Have not you a Symbol of his Presence in the Oracle, where you offer Incense and Blood to your Mercy-Seat of Gold, as much as we to our Images? So that it seems this may be very lawful when we have God's Command for it. And as for those Excuses, that the Pagans ador'd their Images themselves, and the like, I have shew'd from the Patrons of Image-worship among the Gentiles, that they disown'd all this. Now will this make us doubt, whether the Prophets did argue justly, because they answer not to these Apologys of a few wiser Men than the Commonalty were? No, nor did the Apostles argue amiss, tho they take no notice of the Apologys some made for Demon-worship; while the Vulgar had grosser Notions among them of their Images and Demons, and minded none of these fine artificial Apologys. And to these the Prophets and Apostles mainly address'd themselves, while the other wise Men did not produce their Exceptions, and so they were not regarded; but the Charge was rightly fix'd still, according to the common Sentiments and Practice of them they argu'd with.

But indeed there is yet a further reason, besides what has been said, why the Pagans Worship was Idolatry, and from which, all that Mr. B. objects in this matter, may in few words be fully answer'd; leaving the Charge of Idolatry in full force against the Pagans, upon such a ground as will wholly clear the Unitarians from any share in that Crime. And 'tis upon this reason, viz. because the Pagans did terminate their Worship ultimately, not in God, but in the Creature, after all they said, even when they paid but an inferior or relative Worship to their Demons (as

See Jurieu's Crit.

Mr. B. says they did, and no more.) They did not serve 'em in subordination to God, but to Idols or Creatures, to whom it was all refer'd: which I take to be clear from Scripture, which often assures us that the Gentiles, before they receiv'd the Gospel, had no knowledge of the one true God: They are describ'd thus, *At that time ye were without God in the World*, Eph. 2. 12. Again, *Ye then knew not God*, says St. Paul, Gal. 4. 8. i. e. They knew not so much of him, as to direct their Worship to him, as is plainly intended there. They had Gods many, i. e. superior Deitys; and Lords many, i. e. inferior Powers, 1 Cor. 8. 5. Some held one for chief God, others another, Micah 4. 5. or rather the same People held several supreme Deitys, viz. each in his several Province and District; and none of them was accounted to be universally and absolutely supreme over all by Nature, tho comparatively some were greater in power than the rest; which is all that can be said of their mighty Jupiter himself, \* at least in the vulgar Estimate it was no more: however the true God they had not among them. Hence it was, that in the first Command, God requires that we have no other God but him; i. e. not only that we have but one glorious supreme God, but that it be only Him we take for such; even He who was the God of Israel, and brought them out of Egypt, as the Preface shews: else a Man may hold but one God, and yet be the grossest Idolater, if with some he take the Sun, or Moon, or created Nature (either part or whole) to be that one God. Thus it was with most of the Pagans, either some famous Ancestor, or some part of the Heavenly Host, was what they intended by their Jupiter, as learned Men have shown; or if they worship'd some invisible Spirit, which was represented by their Images and Symbols, and which gave out his

Hist. Par. 4. c. 5.

Ora-

Oracles, &c. still this was not the true God of *Israel*, but he was the *Devil* indeed, whom they counted the true God. Thus we read, that the *Gentiles sacrific'd to Devils, and not to God*, (as they perhaps thought) 1 Cor. 10. 25. *Dent. 32. 17.* And hence it may be that the Devil is call'd the God of the *Infidel World*, 2 Cor. 4. 4. however the true one God they knew not.

Now since they had not knowledge of the true one God, their *supreme Worship* must needs terminate in something else, and that must be a Creature or a Fiction. So then in all their *Demon-worship* (which Mr. B. says was but subordinate and inferior Worship) either they ultimately refer'd it higher, or not; if not, then it was not inferior but *supreme Worship*, and so was rank *Idolatry*: but if they did so refer it to a superior Object, whom they held to be the *supreme God*, then that Object not being really the true God, but a Creature, and often the very *Devil*, it follows still that they terminated all in the Creature; and so 'twas still the *same Idolatry*, as if they had terminated all in the *Demon*, or in the Image; the first Object was as good as their *ultimate*, and so they were not at all help'd by distinguishing their *Worship* into subordinate and ultimate. Nor does Mr. B. gain any thing by this Apology for them, since all their *Demon-worship* was *Idolatry* still, in being offer'd up ultimately to the Creature, and in no subordination to God; either they terminated their *Worship* on the *visible Symbol*, or refer'd it to an *invisible Spirit*, which was the Devil (says the Text) both which were *Creatures*. And on these accounts 'tis that the Scripture constantly charges them with *Idolatry*, and not for serving any allow'd mediate Object of God's own setting up, and in subordination to himself. But what is this to the *Unitarians Wor-*

ship of *J.C.*? Are they guilty of any such thing? I mean, of any religious *Worship* that is not refer'd ultimately to the true *Jehovah*? or of worshipping any not subordinate to him? no, far from that. There is then no reasonable pretence of paralleling their *Worship* to that of the Pagans; against these the charge of *Idolatry* lies in full force, while the *Unitarians* are fully justify'd and free.

The Truth is, when Christianity had bore hard on the *Heathen-worship* a while, then they began to refine, and their Philosophers spake more freely against the gross Notions of the *Vulgar*, in their Defence against Christians than before; and therefore the *Christian Fathers* had more occasion than the Apostles to answer to such *Pleas*, when the Pagans came to retort on the Christians, as Mr. B. says they might, if the Christians worship'd *J.C.* as a subordinate constituted God with the *Unitarians*. Accordingly we find it really came to pass so as he says; the Pagans did retort on Christians that very Argument which Mr. B. thinks the Apostles might be assaulted with, if they held with the *Unitarians*: for so *Celsus* pleads, that they did no more in worshipping their *Demons*, than the Christians in worshipping *Christ*: If, says he, the Christians worship'd nothing else but God, they might seem reasonable in their contempt of others; but when they do abundantly worship him, who was of late original, and yet believe they offend not God in reverencing his Minister, they are unreasonable, *Orig. cont. Celsum*, l. 8. p. 385. So that it seems the Pagans did so understand the *Christian Doctrine*, as to spy a place for their Objection (of recriminating on Christians the *Worship* of an inferior Lord) which in the *Unitarian Scheme* there is room for (as Mr. B. observes) but not in his; and therefore the former seems to be the *Primitive Doctrine*.



So we find in *Arnobius*, l. 1. c. 20. that it was usual to object against the Primitive Christians, that they worship'd a *Man* in the Worship of *J. C.* Not only the *Gentiles*, but the *Jews* also had such Apprehensions, as appears in the Case of *Polycarp* the Martyr, *Enseb. Hist.* l. 4. c. 15. whom they suppos'd the Christians might worship on the same score as they worship'd Christ. But had they known that the *Christians* reputed *J. C.* for the supreme God by Nature, they could scarcely have imagin'd, that they would leave off worshipping him, to worship a mere *Man*. And tho the Church of *Smyrna* do disown the Worship of any other Person but *J. C.* they plainly intend it of any other *Man*, or of any other who is not the supreme God; him they worship'd as *God's Son*, but to no other except God himself they gave this Honour. They can't mean that Christ was the only Object of Worship (for that would exclude the Father) but the only *Man*. And as such, the *Jews* charge them with worshipping him, which the learned *Daille* acknowledges \*. When I consider this Passage and others of *Celsus* (who of a *Jew* is suppos'd to have turn'd Pagan) I am satisfy'd, that the *Jews* did very early begin to accuse the Christians of worshipping a *Man*; and I wonder any should alledg their Silence in not accusing Christians of Idolatry, as an Argument that the *Christians* did not worship a Creature: for since they charg'd them with worshipping a *Man* as *God's Minister*, they either judg'd that Worship to be against the first Command, and so must count it Idolatry; or did not reckon all inferior Worship (supposing a divine Command which the Christians plea-

ded) to be Idolatry, and so had no reason to charge them with it: but that they did impute to them the Worship of another beside the great God, is very apparent.

The Apostle (says Mr. B.) should have fix'd his Charge against the Heathen on this, that they worship'd their inferior Gods, without a Warrant from the true God. Why, just so the Primitive Christians did: for when the Pagans produc'd such Apologys for themselves as Mr. B. mentions, viz. that they did but as Christians did in the Worship of Christ, the Christians make that very Answer which Mr. B. dislikes in the Unitarians, viz. *That we Christians have the true God's Command for worshipping J. C. which the Heathens had not for worshipping their Demons*: for thus it was that *Origen* answer'd to *Celsus*, l. 8. p. 384. He asks him, whence he could prove that *God has granted to them* (i. e. the Demons) *to be worshipp'd*; and then he proceeds to shew that to *J. C.* he had granted this Honour, from *John* 5. 23.

This Mr. B. may find in Dr. *Whitby* himself, in his *Idol. of the Rom. Ch.* &c. so hard is it to write against the Papists and the Unitarians with Consistency. Therefore, by the way, I wonder with what Ingenuity that learned Doctor could pretend to prove *J. C.* to be esteem'd the true and supreme God by *Origen*, from his Worship of him, *Treat. de Christi Deit.* p. 12, 14, 117. when yet himself owns that *Origen* gave him only inferior Worship, and deny'd him to be the God who is Lord over all, in that former Book, *Idol. Ch. Rom.* p. 223, 224, 356. Nay, he lately cites him again as denying *J. C.* to be the Object of proper Prayer, in his *Paraphr.* on *John* 16. 23.

\* *Clare* significant, *scilicet, nullum alium hominem a Christianis religiose cultum fuisse, prater unum Christum.* *Daille de Cult. Relig. objecto*, p. 509.

But because Mr. B. sends his Reader to this Doctor for full proof in this Dispute, I'll recite his Words: *It is evident that Origen, by that Expression, I and my Father are one, did not intend to argue the Unity of Essence, but of Affection only betwixt God and Christ; nor yet to say our Saviour was that God who is Lord of all; for this expressly he denys.* In the other place the Doctor's Words are, *When Origen discourses of this Subject, he usually says that we must put up our Petitions to God by Christ; and having once confess'd that we must pray directly to Christ, whom he conceiv'd to be inferior to the Father, he makes this distinction, that Prayer may be taken properly, or in an improper and abusive sense: and in this sense alone he doth approve of Prayer made to Christ.* And by this time one may judge, whether the learned Doctor had any great reason to send us to Origen among others; or Mr. B. to send his learned Reader to the Doctor to know Origen's Judgment in this matter; who, after all the Worship of J. C. which he pleads for, does (by the Doctor's own Representation, when out of this Controversy) design no such Worship as might declare him to be the infinite God, but contrarily such inferior Worship as might shew that he thought him to be not such.

Now I suppose his other Testimonys have the same force; and if Origen could say the Christians worship'd none but one God, and yet was for their worshipping J. C. with other inferior Worship, why might not the other Fathers do the same? 'Tis plain they mean that none but God was worship'd with divine Worship, nor any but his Son with any inferior religious Worship, which yet in a sense was one and the same Worship; of which presently.

Thus we see the first Christians could vindicate the Worship of J. C. as Mediator, without ceasing to con-

demn the *Demon*-worship of the Pagans, on this very ground, that J. C. was authoriz'd by the supreme God to have this Honour which those had not; and this agrees exactly with the Unitarian Principles.

But then, says Mr. B. why does the Apostle charge the Pagans with this, *That they worship'd the Creature besides (more than) the Creator, and with serving them who by Nature were not Gods?* since the Christians did the like in the Worship of J. C. if he was not by Nature the supreme God. I answer in general, 'tis probable the Apostle speaks there of their serving the Creatures as Gods, when they were not Gods, with supreme Worship; for they serv'd 'em beyond the Creator, says the Text (which the Christians did not do) and this the Apostle censures absolutely: for whether they had a Warrant to worship any inferior Lords or not, it was nothing to the Business here, since that could be no ground for worshipping any Creature as the true God. No, nothing but a truly divine Nature could be a ground for such divine Worship; and therefore the Apostle grounded the Charge on a right bottom, in blaming 'em for serving Creatures as Gods, that by Nature were not Gods, and so no Objects of such high Honour, which did not depend on a Command of God, but on the Nature of the Object, the like to which Christians did not in their subordinate Worship of J. C. nor do the Unitarians.

But let me consider those two Texts more particularly; to begin with Rom. 1. 25. *They worship'd and serv'd the Creature more than the Creator.* What says this against them who worship none but the Creator with supreme Worship? not that under the Notion of Creatures, they could designedly respect them above God (as Mr. B. seems to think we mean, when he accuses it as Nonsense, p. 138.) but in their blind



blind Mistake, they fix'd their Devotions on what truly were but Creatures, and pass'd by the Creator; as they who believ'd one God, but worship'd the *Sun*, or *Fire*, &c. for him, did really serve the Creature, and pass by the Creator: or tho they own'd one God, yet they might do more service to the Creature, to their Images and Dæmons, than to the Supreme. It is possible a Papist may worship the Virgin *Mary* more than God, and yet hold her to be but a Creature; and the sensual Sinner may serve the *World* or his *Belly* more than the Creator, tho he knows the other are but Creatures. So that here is no such *Nonsense*, in supposing Men to serve the Creature beyond God.

Mr. B. is so sensible that this Text will do him no service against the *Unitarians*, as our Bibles have it, that he is forc'd to give it a corrupt, or at best an ambiguous Turn: He had rather have it thus, *They serv'd the Creature besides the Creator*. But I dare appeal to any *Trinitarian* Critick, if the word *besides* set thus between two Nouns, does not in the New Testament note Comparison, and be not render'd *above* or *beyond*, as in this very Epistle, *ch. 14. 5. One esteems one Day above another.* *Heb. 1. 9. Above thy Fellows.* And tho sometimes it may be render'd *præter*, or *beside*, yet that may be, as *Beza* and *Turretine* render it here, *præterito Creatore, passing beside*, or by, *the Creator*; i. e. they serv'd the Creature, and not the Creator. But Mr. B. would have the word *besides* to signify a Conjunction, as if it were thus, *besides the Creator they also serv'd the Creature*; which is not the fair Sense of the Original, nor so natural and genuine a Version, as that which we have, viz. *more than the Creator*; which is not the *Unitarians* Case, who worship none beyond God, nay worship none besides

God, with ultimate or supreme Respect.

The other Text is *Gal. 4. 8.* where *St. Paul* describing their former *Gentile* State, says, *When ye knew not God, ye did service to them that by Nature are not Gods.* Whence Mr. B. would infer, that to worship what has not the *Infinite Nature* of the Supreme God, is Idolatry, like to that of the *Heathens*, and the formal reason of their Sin. And this he thinks the *Unitarians* do, in worshipping *J. C.* while they deny him to be the infinite God by Nature. To this I answer, 1. That the Apostle speaks plainly of their worshipping those false Gods in the place of the Supreme God, and not in subordination to him; which no doubt was Idolatry, And this appears by his opposition of *those Gods* to the one true God, implying that they worship'd them in lieu of him, whom they now knew, i. e. as supreme; and not in any subordination to him. For whatever Thoughts Mr. B. may have of those *Pagans*, the Apostle plainly says they had no knowledge of the true and infinite God. *Ye knew not God*; and therefore what they worship'd in chief must needs be what by nature was not *this God*, but some part of the Creation, whether a Man, or the Sun, &c. nor was their mighty *Jupiter* or *Jove* any more. And in all their inferior Worship of *Heroes* or *Dæmons*, if they ultimately refer'd their Worship to any superior God, yet it was not to the only true supreme Being; and consequently they must terminate all their Worship in some Creature, as has been said. But what is this to the *Unitarians*, who do not worship *J. C.* with supreme and ultimate Worship; and whose religious Worship of him ultimately rests in the Infinite God alone? The *Pagans* might say they terminated their Worship in the one true God, and that they worship'd him in chief; but

St.

St. Paul says, *They knew him not*; and upon this condemns them. They cou'd not make out these Pretensions, which Mr. B. and some of their Apologists make for 'em, to excuse 'em from idolizing Creatures or Fictions, by their supreme Worship. Nor do I doubt, but that what some accounted *inferior Demons*, the Vulgar ador'd as supreme.

2. Let it be how it will, 'tis nothing against the *Unitarians*, who hold J. C. to be a subordinate Lord, or God by *Nature*. The antient Fathers (says Dr. Whitby on Eph. 2. 3.) constantly interpret *ἐκ θεοῦ* by *truly* or *really*: Now we say, that J. C. is truly such a God as we hold him to be, and as our Worship implies: *He is truly Partaker of a Divine Nature*, not only in moral Graces, but in glorious Dominion and Authority, with suitable Strength and Wisdom. Those Demons were no Gods at all, as Mr. Baxter says truly; they cou'd not make out their *Nature* or real Qualifications, which we can in J. C. The Apostle might not mean, *they were not infinite Gods by Nature*, but not truly any sort of Gods. Either way it touches not the *Unitarians* at all.

Yet I doubt not but the words may very justly and naturally be read something otherwise: *Ἐδούλωσθε τοῖς θεοῖς οὗτοι, οὗτοι*; *Ye were in bondage to Gods that in Nature had no being*, or by *Nature were not*. Mere Chimæra's, and artificial Fictions; the *Vanities* of the Heathen, and indeed but *Nullities*; for so were many of their pretended Deitys: They never existed in *Nature*, much less had they ever the Power or Office pretended to; so that as *Gods* or *Lords* they had *no being*. And this is just parallel to what the same Apostle says, that *an Idol is nothing*, 1 Cor. 8. 4. There are no such things in nature, as the Heathens *Gods many and Lords many*. There may be *Images* and *Demons*, but no *Gods*,

nor *Lords*: But we Christians have one real supreme God, viz. the *Father*; and one real subordinate Lord, viz. J. C. There is such a Lord in *Nature*, and he has the real *Nature* and *Abilities* of such an anointed God, as well as the *Character* and *Commission*; and so he cannot be rank'd among the *Pagan Idols* who were not, or were nothing, sometimes as to their *Being*, but always as to their *Power* and *Dignity*.

I am not sensible of any thing like *Violence* done to the Text by this *Sense* and *Reading*; but rather that it seems most natural and easy to the words, and most suitable to the Context. For the Apostle is setting forth the noble Liberty of these *Galatians* by the Gospel, in comparison of their former servile State. They were as *Servants*, but now as *Sons* at age, v. 7. But what are they *Slaves* to? why says he in this Verse, *When ye knew not God, ye were in slavery to such Gods as in Nature were nothing*. For what we render, *Ye did Service*, signifies ye were *Slaves*, or in *bondage*, as appears thro the whole Context; so the Word is render'd, ver. 3, 9, 25. Nothing could more emphatically describe their base Degeneracy, while Pagans, than this, that they were under a superstitious slavish Subjection to what had no *Being*; and were terrify'd with *Fictions*, and did homage to a *Nullity*. Therefore nothing seems more for the Apostle's purpose, than this fair Sense of the words, which are not against the *Unitarians*, who know J. C. to be such a real God, or Lord by *Nature*, as those of the *Pagans* were not. Their *superior Gods* were not such, nor their *subordinate Gods* such in nature and reality, as they accounted 'em to be; but our supreme God the Father is such, and our subordinate Lord J. his Son, is really and in nature such as we pretend 'em to be, and as answers to their Characters: So that we can  
boast



boast their Gods are not like ours, nor their Lords like ours.

Nor does the Apostle reproach 'em with Idolatry in doing this, but with the base and ignoble Degeneracy of their Condition; so that it appears not that he speaks so much of Worship, as of the Slavery and Subjection they were under to these Fictions. But will Mr. B. say that we owe no Subjection to the Man J. C. whose Nature is not Divine? Sure since the human Nature is invested with Dominion, as Mr. B. owns, and acts its part of Royal Authority, as he speaks, p. 89. it will claim Subjection answerable to that Share of Dominion it is invested with. And if there be any Service due to the Man Christ, then the Text does not condemn all Service to what is not by Nature the infinite God; since the human Nature, tho' united, is not a Divine Nature: and yet sure some Service is due to the exalted Manhood, which is made a Lord and Prince over Men and Angels by God's Reward (but the Divine Nature must be so without it) and has therefore a far greater Title to the Character of a subordinate God than those Angels, and which Pagan Idols had not.

Now it is easy to apply much of what has been said about the Pagans, to them of the Roman Church, whose Practices seem to have too near an Affinity with the others. If the Papists worship any Creature with Divine ultimate Worship, as they seem to do the Cross and the Host; if they worship Images, or erect unwarranted Symbols of the Divine Presence and Grace; or if the common People esteem these as God, or give to them as high Worship as to him; or lastly, if they set up other Mediators in the place of Jesus Christ, to invade his Office (which things they are charg'd

with) then are they still as much Idolaters as ever; tho' the Unitarians are clear of it, in their Worship of the Lord J. C. as a subordinate Lord and Mediator, with subordinate Worship.

Mr. B. says, they assign the like grounds of the religious Worship of the Saints: But what then? Can they make 'em good? The Pagans might assign the same grounds for Divine Worship of the Sun, or some other Creature (which they took to be the supreme God) as Mr. B. does for worshipping the true God; but they did not assign them truly, and so they were Idolaters still. This is our Case, compar'd with the Papists. Does Mr. B. think they can give as good proofs of God's investing the Saints or Angels with universal Power in Heaven and Earth, or of their Commission to be our Mediators and our Judges, as the Unitarians bring for the Lord Jesus's Claim to all this? If not, it was unrighteously said of him, That they assign the like grounds of their religious Worship of Saints and Angels; That their Cause is the same, and that they may defend it on the same Principles, p. 138. Should I judge justly, if I said a Pagan (that should mistake the Devil or other Creature for God) assign'd the like grounds of his Divine Worship with Christians, and that his Cause was the same, and he might as well defend it? God forbid I should so reproach my Maker, or slander his Servants! Sure 'tis enough that the one are mistaken in their Object, and the other are right; and so the grounds they go upon are very different, the one being Truth, and the other a false pretence: For we think there is some little difference to be made between what is commanded and what is forbidden, says Dr. Stillingfleet in his *Idolat. of the Church of Rome*, p. 97.

But says Mr. B. we are not inquiring whether the Popish Invocation of Saints, &c. be commanded or uncommanded,

ed, but whether in it self it be injurious to God. But by his leave this ought to be the Inquiry; since herein the Injury will lie, if it be an Invasion on God's Honour and Authority to set up unqualify'd unallow'd Mediators in his heavenly Court. And I dare say, that if he will approve of all that religious Worship of Angels, Saints, and Demons, which does not attribute to them any infinite Divine Perfections in its very nature, then he may be a much greater Friend to the Popish and Pagan Worship, than Mr. E. appears to be.

Thus we see, that the Unitarians Practice and Principles plainly destroy that Creature-Worship, which was practis'd among the Pagans; while they so carefully reserve intire to God all Divine Worship, and all subordinate religious Worship to that one Mediator the Lord Jesus, whom the great God has rais'd to this Honour, and this it self ultimately, to the Glory of the Father, Phil. 2. 10, 11. Amen.

The Sum of what is argu'd on this Head, from the Fathers, is, That they profess to worship one God, and him only; and yet they worship'd J. C. Ergo they held J. C. to be essentially the Supreme God. But when all is consider'd, I believe this Conclusion will not follow from the Premises, as they are found in the Fathers: For,

1. 'Tis most certain they profess to worship God and his Son: Here then is something besides God alone that is worship'd. This is frequent in Origen, Justin Martyr, &c. And that they meant another Being by the Son, will appear from what shall be presently observ'd.

2. Their current and most usual Form was to worship the Father by his Son, or in his Name. So Clemens Romanus ends his Epistle. So Justin Martyr says, that at the Communion

the Minister, or President, pronounces Praises to the Father of all, in the Name of the Son, and by the Holy Spirit. By which 'tis plain, that the Father and Son were worship'd with a very different Respect; which not only must follow from the unequal Esteem they had for them, but is most expressly own'd by Origen, the most Learned of 'em all, and who had best study'd the deep Points of our Religion: who in answer to Celsus (who charg'd the Christians with worshipping others beside God, in their Worship of J. C.) gives an account how far they worship'd him, and how the Father, *offerentes Deo universorum Domino preces, per suum unigenitum; cui prius eas adhibemus rogantes, ut ipse dignetur tanquam Pontifex, preces nostras offerre Deo optimo maximo: i. e. We offer up our Prayers to God, the Lord over all things, by his only Son; to whom we first bring them, praying that he as our High Priest would vouchsafe to present our Prayers to God most High.* This, he says, was the *quantum possumus*, the utmost Worship they could give, p. 386. Now is this to worship him as Supreme God, viz. to pray to him to officiate for us with God as Intercessor? Again, speaking of praying to God by him, he adds, p. 233. *We will pray to the Word, provided we may distinguish between doing it in a strict or proper Sense, and in an abusive one.* So that he will not allow Prayer to him properly taken, only in a sort, as thro him it is put up to God. Is this possible for one to say, who worship'd him as Supreme God? No, they held the Father and Son for two Objects, and distinguish'd the Worship into two sorts, as you see here.

3. The Account which they give of their worshipping the Father and Son as one, and in some sort with one Worship, is not such as speaks them to be one in the same numerical Essence, or one and the same infinite Spirit or Substance. 'Tis most evident that they cou'd not mean such a Worship;



as implies this, with any Consistency with their Expressions elsewhere. *Lactantius*, l. 4. c. 6. expressly says, that God the Father, before he set about the Creation, *sanctum & incorruptibilem genuit Spiritum, quem Filium nuncuparet*: He begot a Spirit whom he call'd his Son, which Title he did not give to any other of the Spirits whom he afterwards created. So then when he had begotten a Spirit, there must be two Spirits. And even when *Origen* is treating about their Unity, and labouring to make 'em one Object of Worship, in answer to *Celsus*, who said they were two, he sticks not to say, *We religiously worship the Father of Truth, and the Son who is the Truth*; *duos quidem*

*Substantia* (\* Hypo-  
\* Which did in *stasi*) *unum vero* Concor-  
that time sig- *dia*, &c. Two indeed in  
nify Sub- Substance, but one by Agree-  
stance, as its ment and Concord. So  
true Sense. then here are two Sub-  
Socr. Schol. stances worship'd: Tho  
l. 3. c. 7. at another time perhaps  
they may be call'd one,  
in regard to their mutual Concord  
and Unity of Will, as Christians are  
one.

But how is it then that they could pretend to worship none but God, when they worship'd both the Father and his Son? As far as I can see, it was grounded upon a near Union of the Objects, which they still maintain'd, and the Unity of the external Acts of Worship.

1. They reckon'd that still the Father and Son might be deem'd as one Object in a political Sense, tho two Spirits, one subordinate to the other: Because their Dominion (which is the ground of Worship) was politically but one, as that of a King and his Son, or his Vice-Roy, or Ambassador, the Homage also done them was in a sense but one. Thus *Origen*, when treating upon this very matter, says, p. 386. *Celsus would never think we worship ano-*

*ther besides God, if he understood those Words, The Father and I are one.* But what Unity does *Origen* interpret it of? Why, says he, that none may be startled at this, let him mind that Text, And the Multitude of them that believ'd, were of one Heart and one Soul; and this may help him to understand the other, The Father and I are one. And then adds, that tho they are two in Substance, yet they are one in Consent of Will. And *Lactantius*, l. 4. c. 29. more fully opens the matter by this near Resemblance, viz. of one who has an only-beloved Son, who is in his Father's House, and in his power: Tho, says he, he grants him the Name and Power of Lord or Master, yet *Civili Jure* it is call'd one House and one Lord. So the Father and the Son being unanimous in the World, it is one God, because one is as two, and two as one; the Son always obeying the Father's Will, as he adds. And again, he that acknowledges the Son, says he, l. 4. c. 25. worships the Father together with the Son, because the Son is the Ambassador of the most High Father. Here is a Political Unity between them, that occasions the calling it one Worship of one God. I deny not but they held also a natural Conjunction between the two, so near that they were not separated asunder, nor held as divers divided Beings, but yet without one Thought of an Equality (which serves my purpose) whenever they were compar'd together.

2. This might be further grounded upon the Unity of the Act of Worship, which at once respects both these Objects. As the Respect done to an Ambassador is at the same time a Respect to his Prince; and yet both are not equally honour'd, tho it be in the same Act: so when a Son is honour'd merely for his Relation to his Father, both are honour'd together, tho not equally. Thus 'tis the same Prayer that we present to the Father, which we offer to Christ, that

it may be presented by him, as the same *Sacrifice* was presented to the High Priest, which was by him to God: We always join the *Father* and the *Mediator* in the same Devotion, but the same physical Act may be morally two. And this is just according to the abovesaid Account of true Christian Worship from *Origen*, who truly says, that a Christian does *ἀνεγίσκει*, undividedly and inseparably worship the God of Gods, thro *Jesus Christ*. If I pray to the Father, it implies that it be thro the *Mediator*; if to J. C. 'tis that he may present it to God, where all Worship terminates. This seems to be their most natural meaning, when they say they only worship one God, tho they worship him thro his Son *Jesus Christ*; which is also a sort of Worship of the Son. If it be not so, I doubt they will not be very consistent with themselves. However I fetch not the grounds of my Faith from any, but the truly *Primitive Fathers*, I mean the *Apostles*: who I think appear on my side, without the Obscurity that is in the others, who soon began to be corrupted, as was foretold.

But what Mr. B. says, p. 114. *That those of the third Age insist on the universal Practice of giving Divine Worship to Jesus Christ, as one great Argument to prove that the Deity of Christ was the Belief of the two foregoing*: It is a mere Boast and Flourish, of which he gives no proof. I desire him to shew who of that Age ever prov'd that J. C. had been held to be the *supreme God* (which is the Question) by the two first Ages, from their Practice of Divine Worship. No, they neither so believ'd, nor so practis'd, that appears: And the *Trinitarians* themselves cannot but own that the *Arians* offer'd to appeal to the preceding Ages and Fathers, for a Testimony to their Opinion; and that it was declin'd,

as, besides others, Bishop *Taylor* confesses. *Liberty of Prophesy*, p. 73. 8°. It might be found that they call him *God* indeed, and that he was worship'd as *Mediator*; but never, as I find, that he was God equal to the Father, nor worship'd with equal or supreme Worship. 'Tis plain that *Deus super quem non est alius*, a God that has none above him, was their Character of the Father, in distinction from the Son, of whom they deny'd it, as Dr. *Whitby* cannot but *Paraph. on* confess. And if a God John 7. 17. that has another above him, can be equal to a God that has none above him; or if two who are unequal in Excellency, can be both alike *Infinite*, that is, can have both of 'em all the same Excellencies in perfection; I think there is an end of all rational Discourse on the point, when Writings and Words must not be taken with Simplicity, in their obvious Meaning, but be made to signify quite contrary to the common Sense of Mankind, merely to serve an *Hypothesis* at a pinch.

Let me only by the by take notice of one Passage more from Mr. B. p. 157. where he pretends that the *Unitarians* lay as great a stumbling in the way of the *Mahometans*, by giving religious Worship to one who is God by Office, as the *Trinitarians* do by their Doctrine of the Incarnation; and that the *Mahometans* worship not Mahomet himself. To which I must reply, that 'tis not merely the Incarnation of a God in general, that is pretended to be such a Stumbling-Block, but that one who is God should be incarnate, and yet two other Persons be God too, who are not so. This is a terrible Scandal to the *Jews* and *Mahometans*. Tho to the ordinary *Pagans* this may be pleasing enough, as agreeing with *Polytheism*: But as to the *Mahometans*, I may safely say, the



the giving *Divine* Worship to J. C. as a Supreme God, is a fatal Stumbling-block which they are not able to get over. Whereas the Worship of him with inferior Worship, as a great Prophet and Lord, would be none, if other Difficulties were remov'd. For Mr. B. is much mistaken in saying they worship not *Mahomet*, for in reading the *Turkish* History I find the contrary, and meet with three sorts of Worship paid by them to that *false Prophet*: First, They swear by him. Secondly, They bow their Bodies in Adoration at the mention of his Name, as they do at *God's*, but only they bow not their Heads so low. And Thirdly, They pray to him. And therefore Mr. B. goes on a false ground. (See *Pitts's Account of Mahometans*, p. 41.) All Praise to God, and to Mahomet our Master, is their Worship.

And now having finish'd my Argument, upon the review I have said what I really believe is the Truth of the Gospel, and to the true Honour of my *Blessed Saviour*. If any think otherwise, I can however profess from my very Heart, that I have not done it from any Inclination to lessen the Honour of the Lord of Glory. I thank God I am much rather dispos'd to congratulate than to envy his highest Glory, were it ever so great, if real and just; but I dare not accept his Person, nor talk wickedly, even for God. I am jealous for the peerless Majesty of the Lord of Hosts, the God of all Gods.

After all, tho I am not conscious of any wrong Interpretation of the Sacred Scripture, yet I dare not speak in the ranting Stile of a late furious Writer, who on supposition that J. C. be not the Supreme God, of the same Essence with the Father, sticks not to say, that *Mahomet* was

far the *honestest Person* of the two, since J. C. has written in such an ensnaring dangerous manner to insinuate the contrary into mens Minds. I say, I dare not so boldly and scornfully accuse my Saviour, as to say on the contrary, That if he be the same God, and the self-same Being with the Father (which I am still satisfy'd the Scripture never says) he then betrays Men into Infidelity, into Blasphemy, and Atheism; and that Christianity is but a *Farce*, a *Trick*, &c. (which is that Author's Stile) because he has said so much that looks the contrary way, as if he would deceive Men. No, I doubt not but what he has done in this matter is wisely done: tho he may have left many things difficult and dubious, 'tis not for one side to say he means thus, or he is a Deceiver; and the other, that he means the contrary, or he is so. What scorn must be done to the *Holy Jesus* before Infidels, when all sides shall take this Liberty? Sure that Gentleman never considers that the *Unitarians* think he has spoken as much to countenance their Sentiments, as he can imagine he has said in the Gospel to uphold his; and that at this rate the *Papists* may say, he is a Deceiver like *Mahomet*, if the *Host* be not his proper true Body, since he said it; and the *Anthropomorphites*, that God is a Lyar if he have not proper bodily Parts, which he so oft professes. Thus it may go round to *Remonstrants* and *Contra-Remonstrants*, *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*; and where shall it stop? Thus by the Majority of Christians themselves, their common Lord shall be cast for an Impostor, and the *Jews* justify'd in crucifying him. What then must *Jews* and *Mahometans* think of Christ and his Religion, when Christians give him so little Credit, that they profess to renounce him, if their particular Sense of some Sayings be not what he intended? I am griev'd that

that so many *Trinitarians* should discover so little Reverence for the Holy Jesus, and breath forth so much Rashness and Rage, Malignity and Uncharitableness; and while they plead for *his Deity*, seem to put off their own *Humanity*, save that they manage all with the *Wrath of Man*, which shall not work the Righteousness of God. I pray God quench this intemperate Zeal, which comes not from above; for that is *gentle and peaceable*. Whilst I heartily pray, that what I have written may never prosper nor prevail, unless it be the Cause of God and Truth, which I have pleaded: *Let my Tongue cleave to the Roof of my Mouth, and my Right Hand* (that writes this) *forget her Cunning*, if I prefer not the Truth and Honour of God and his Christ before any By-Interest or Reputation in this World. I sometimes desire to believe higher things of the Son of God: but when I look into the Scriptures, I cannot find Encouragement to regard him higher than as my Mediator with the most High, whose *Ability to save to the utmost* is laid mainly or wholly on this, *because he ever lives to make Intercession for us with God*, Heb. 7. 26. But sure none will say, that the Supreme God is mighty to save, because he can intercede with another for Help and Salvation.

To conclude, I will only add, that supposing the matter of Dispute were equally evident on both sides (which I don't think, nor do my Adversaries) yet I judg there is much more Safety in this point of the Worship of J. C. on my side, than on the other. For supposing (as Mr. B. and the Modal *Trinitarians* say) that J. C. were the very same Being with the *Father*; yet in worshipping one God the *Father*, we give Worship to the Divine Being: and he who worships one Infinite God, surely worships all that is adorable with Divine Worship. I desire to

know what I leave out *unworship'd*, when I worship God the Father of all, and of J. C. If they tell me I pay no Honour to the three *Modes* or *Personalities* which they suppose to be in God; I must ask them, if there be any divine adorable Perfections in the other *two Modes* or *Personalities*, which are not in the Father? If not, then I leave nothing unworship'd that is to be worship'd in God, more than they. If there be, then the *God and Father of J. C.* has not all Perfections in him, nor is the Object of all Divine Adoration, but here is some Divine Worship which he cannot challenge; which I think is a very reproachful Affront to him, to whom not only some, but *all Honour and Glory, all Blessing and Praise is due*.

Nay, supposing there were such *personal Modes*, yet since they are not the grounds of Worship (for we don't worship the *Father* for having a *Son*, nor the *Son* for having the Holy Spirit) but God is only worship'd for his essential Perfections and Dominion, for his infinite Power, Wisdom, and Goodness, &c. which are common to all the suppos'd *Three*: it follows there can be no such fault in worshipping God without regard to these distinct Modes, which are not properly adorable, only the Essence under them. I adore not the *Paternity*, or *Filiation*, or *Procession*, but I adore infinite Power and Goodness, &c. in worshipping God, even the *Father*.

But now on the other hand, supposing J. C. to be another *Being*, next, but inferior to the Father; the *Trinitarians*, who worship no other Being, but what is the Father's, or the Supreme Being, must needs be found to give no Worship at all to J. C. according to Mr. B. Tho they hold to the *two Names* of God and his *Son*, yet they leave out the last in reality, and cast off one Object of Worship; for they worship not the *Son*, while they honour the *Father's Being*.



Being only. The Unitarians leave not out *their* Christ, who is suppos'd to be in the Supreme Being; but the Trinitarians leave out *ours* and disown him, not the Name, but the Being or Thing; unless they worship the human Nature or Creature. At most it can but be pretended against me, that I give too much to J. C. according to my Notion of him (which yet I judge I have vindicated) whereas if they err, they not only give him too little, but no Worship at all; crying in effect, that the Lamb (or sacrific'd Man J. C.) is not worthy to receive Honour and Worship. Tho'tis plain in Rev. 5. 13. that he is worship'd as distinct from God in his Dignity; not as sitting on the Throne, which is God's peculiar Royalty, but as standing before the midst of it among the Angels or Saints, v. 6. and so is honour'd subordinately to the great enthron'd God.

So that 'tis a Value for the Honour of J. C. against those who degrade him as unworthy, that makes me plead his Cause against the modal Trinitarians; who, amidst the abundance of magnificent Flourishes, and pompous Strains about his Glory, do really represent him as too mean for our subordinate Worship and Homage; denying him that deriv'd Glory, which the Father in reward of his Obedience has bestow'd upon him: and so deprive him of his great Glory. Nor does it make any amends to him, to hear them talk of his Divine Worship, while under the name of Christ or God's anointed, they mean God himself; and so give that Worship not to Christ himself, but to another, viz. to the Father, whose Being is not the Son's, but his own.

With this kind of inferior Worship our Lord has been honour'd from the beginning; and tho there has been a great Defection from this pure Reli-

gion, yet as I believe the generality of honest plain Christians have intended no other Worship of J. C. than as Mediator (amidst all the unintelligible Phrases of another import, that their Teachers put into their mouths) so a considerable Body of the Christian Church has all along so worship'd him; I mean all the numerous Churches of the Nestorians, who have in this point preserv'd the Truth from the Times of Arianism: Nestoriani non adorabant Christum ut Deum, & a Patribus Idololatriæ accusantur, Turret. Compen. p. 168, 170. Now the Nestorians are acknowledg'd to be a Branch of the Arians, or very near akin to them. See Jurieu's Pastor. Let. vol. 1. p. 157. Sandii Nucl. p. 118, 119. And these Churches in the East are so numerous, that, if Sandius compute aright, they are far more than the Members of the Church of Rome, and have all along continu'd for so many Ages, that for ought I know the Unitarians may pretend in them to as good a Succession and Visibility, as any other Churches, if that was needful, especially in this Point of Worship.

Thus I think I have taken in all that Mr. B. has offer'd on the Head of Worship, which I judg'd most proper to be answer'd; both because he seems to be especially confident of the Strength of his Argument here, and also because, while other Arguments contain only Matter of Speculation immediately, this does immediately concern our daily Practice, in our Addresses to Heaven, in which a serious Christian will earnestly require Satisfaction, and I think cannot have true Peace, till he has used serious Endeavours to know his Duty: In which thou, O Father of Lights, be merciful to us and guide us. I am a Stranger on this Earth: Hide not thy Commandments from me.

Laus Deo, & Christo Mediatori


E I N I S



THE  
Supreme Deity  
OF  
God the Father

DEMONSTRATED.

Being a Short, but Full Answer to  
Dr. *Sherlock's* Proofs of our Sa-  
viour's Divinity, or whatever can  
be urg'd against the Supremacy of  
the First Person of the HOLY  
TRINITY.



---

---

LONDON;

Printed in the Year 1706.



Being only. The Unitarians leave not out *their* Christ, who is suppos'd to be in the Supreme Being; but the Trinitarians leave out *ours* and disown him, not the Name, but the Being or Thing; unless they worship the human Nature or Creature. At most it can but be pretended against me, that I give too much to J. C. according to my Notion of him (which yet I judge I have vindicated) whereas if they err, they not only give him too little, but no Worship at all; crying in effect, that the Lamb (or sacrific'd Man J. C.) *is not worthy to receive Honour and Worship.* Tho 'tis plain in Rev. 5. 13. that he is worship'd as distinct from God in his Dignity; not as *sitting on the Throne*, which is God's peculiar Royalty, but as *standing* before the midst of it among the Angels or Saints, v. 6. and so is honour'd subordinately to the great enthron'd God.

So that 'tis a Value for the Honour of J. C. against those who degrade him as unworthy, that makes me plead his Cause against the modal Trinitarians; who, amidst the abundance of magnificent Flourishes, and pompous Strains about his Glory, do really represent him as *too mean* for our subordinate Worship and Homage; denying him that deriv'd Glory, which the Father in reward of his Obedience has bestow'd upon him: and so deprive him of his great Glory. Nor does it make any amends to him, to hear them talk of his Divine Worship, while under the name of Christ or God's anointed, they mean God himself; and so give that Worship not to Christ himself, but to another, *viz.* to the Father, whose Being is not the Son's, but his own.

With this kind of *inferior* Worship our Lord has been honour'd from the beginning; and tho there has been a great Defection from this pure Reli-

gion, yet as I believe the generality of honest plain Christians have intended no other Worship of J. C. than as Mediator (amidst all the unintelligible Phrases of another import, that their Teachers put into their mouths) so a considerable Body of the Christian Church has all along so worship'd him; I mean all the numerous Churches of the Nestorians, who have in this point preserv'd the Truth from the Times of Arianism: *Nestoriani non adorabant Christum ut Deum, & a Patribus Idololatria accusantur*, Turret. Comp. p. 168, 170. Now the Nestorians are acknowledg'd to be a Branch of the Arians, or very near akin to them. See *Jurieu's Pastor. Let.* vol. 1. p. 157. *Sandii Nucl.* p. 118, 119. And these Churches in the East are so numerous, that, if Sandius compute aright, they are far more than the Members of the Church of Rome, and have all along continu'd for so many Ages, that for ought I know the Unitarians may pretend in them to as good a Succession and Visibility, as any other Churches, if that was needful, especially in this Point of Worship.

Thus I think I have taken in all that Mr. B. has offer'd on the Head of Worship, which I judg'd most proper to be answer'd; both because he seems to be especially confident of the Strength of his Argument here, and also because, while other Arguments contain only Matter of Speculation *immediately*, this does immediately concern our daily Practice, in our Addresses to Heaven, in which a serious Christian will earnestly require Satisfaction, and I think cannot have true Peace, till he has used serious Endeavours to know his Duty: In which thou, O Father of Lights, be merciful to us and guide us. *I am a Stranger on this Earth: Hide not thy Commandments from me.*

*Laus Deo, & Christo Mediatori.*


E I N I S



THE  
Supreme Deity  
OF  
God the Father

DEMONSTRATED.

Being a Short, but Full Answer to  
Dr. *Sherlock's* Proofs of our Sa-  
viour's Divinity, or whatever can  
be urg'd against the Supremacy of  
the First Person of the HOLY  
TRINITY.



---

---

L O N D O N;

Printed in the Year 1706.



THE  
Supreme Deity

OF  
God the Father

DEMONSTRATED

Being a Short but Full Answer to  
Dr. Sherlock's Proofs of our Sa-  
viour's Divinity, or whatever can  
be urged against the Supremacy of  
the Full Power of the Holy



LONDON

Printed in the Year 1705.

# The Supreme Deity of God the Father demonstrated, &c.

**I**F false Accusations and uncharitable Censures, if torturing some Texts and trifling with others, and all this set off with a magisterial Arrogance and tragical Exclamations, overlooking the mysterious Nonsense of his own Opinions, such as a *deriv'd Self-existent*, or a *begotten First Cause*, &c. and misrepresenting those of his Adversarys, that they may deserve such a Charge; I say, if this be a wise or solid way of confuting the Unitarians, the Doctor has shown himself a brave Champion against them, in his late Book of *the Deity of J. C.* in which there is scarce any thing new, but what is either extravagant or trivial.

The Unitarians cannot but think it very hard to be so virulently insulted by every Trithaist, who stands condemn'd not only of *Heresy*, but *Paganism*. And with relation to the Doctor himself, it has been openly declar'd by divers Dignitarys of the Church, that the Opinion of a *Trinity of infinite Minds* is much worse than *Socinianism*; nay, as much as *Paganism* is worse than *Judaism*, say some. Nor do I take up such an Accusation against so great an Elder in the Church, without two Witnesses: The one Dr. S—th, in the Preface to *Trithaism charg'd upon*



Dr. Sherlock, &c. who declares the abovesaid Opinion to be *Paganism*. The other the Bp of *Gloc — r* in his late *Reflections on Dr. S — ck's Examination*, &c. p. 10. where he tells us his *Examiner* lies under a greater Scandal than that of a *Socinian*, even that of a *Tritheist*. Tho, to do the Doctor Justice, he is even with the *Nominal Trinitarians* or *Modalists*, charging them to be worse than the *Socinians*, on the other hand; because tho he judges their *Heresy* to be the same, yet in the others 'tis join'd with *Nonsense*, which is something worse than *Heresy* alone. And so both Sides declare the *Socinians* to be better than themselves are in the account of each other.

Upon this occasion, one can hardly forbear inquiring how it comes to pass, that Men of the *Tritheistick Notions* have been and are so warmly cherish'd both in the Bosom of the *Church*, and also among the *Dissenters*; when at the same time there is so much Fury and uncharitable Severity among them both, towards the more harmless *Unitarians*. It can be no great Proof either of the Honesty or Justice of those Churches, who deal so partially, as to persecute the less Erroneous, and to dignify them that are more grossly so. The *Unitarians*, it seems, must not speak for themselves; while the others have leave to slander and insult them, as appears by the Doctor's Book.

It is evident his Expositions of the Scripture have been often baffled, which yet he repeats without taking notice of what has been offer'd to overthrow 'em. It were very easy to shew the Vanity of his new Interpretations, which it seems he could not advance without bespattering the Learned Commentators of his own side (I mean not of the *Tritheist* side, but of the *Trinitarian*, if there be a difference) and therefore he lets fly at the Generality of our celebrated Annotators. One while they are with him Men of *Levity* and *Wantonness*, p. 24. another while they assert *downright Heresy*, p. 167. and all because they can see nothing against the *Socinians*, in such Texts as he makes the great Support of his

his Arguments, without one good Reason for it.

The fundamental Text he begins with, is *Rom. 1. 3, 4. Made of the Seed of David, according to the Flesh, and declar'd to be the Son of God with Power, according to the Spirit of Holiness, by the Resurrection from the Dead.* This he calls an *express Declaration of two distinct Natures in the Son of God*: And so there is in every Man, *Flesh and Spirit*; what then? But says he, *according to the Flesh*, is, according to human Nature, and consequently it implies he had another Nature. Tho this be nothing to the *Arians*, yet 'tis not true. That Phrase *κατὰ σάρκα* never signifies according to human Nature: The Doctor knew it well enough, that in *Rom. 4. 1. c. 9. 3. 1 Cor. 10. 18.* where we read, *Abraham our Father after the Flesh, my Kinsmen after the Flesh, Israel after the Flesh*; I say, in all these places it could not be so taken, as if *Israel* and *Abraham* had two Natures, or another beside the human. But because the mention of such Texts had baffled his Argument, he had the Honesty not to take notice of 'em, tho one of 'em was the Verse but one before that which he argues from. Will such childish Craft ever uphold his Cause long? 'Tis plain that the Phrase, *according to the Flesh*, signifies according to Carnal Descent; and if there be any opposition in the other Phrase, *according to the Spirit*, it notes his Spiritual Descent. Not that *J. C.* was constituted of these two, but he had his Origination both ways; he was of his Mother's Substance, by the Power of the Spirit. So that *after the Flesh*, or by the Mother's side, he was the *Son of David*; but by the other side, as from the Spirit, he was the *Son of God*, tho the same Man still: And then what does all his straining come to? Is not here a goodly Foundation for his Proof of Christ's Deity?

Another weak Observation he makes on *John 1. 14.* The *Unitarians* say, it should be render'd, *the Word was (not was made) Flesh*; because the common reading justifies *Eutychianism*. For one thing is not properly made another by mere Union to it; but by a natural Change, as the *Water was made Wine*. No personal Union can justify the saying *God was made Man*: We cannot say, the *Soul is made Body*



*Body or Bones, because united thereto. So that to say the Word, meaning God, was made Flesh, is far beyond a personal Union, and implies that the infinite Divine Nature was really chang'd into a corruptible thing. I challenge the Doctor, or any Man, to shew me that ever ἐγένετο signifies was united; and if not, then the Trinitarian Sense of that Text is certainly false, except they allow the Eutychian Heretical Sense. And therefore the Unitarians say the Word was Flesh, or Christ the Word and Messenger of God was a frail mortal Man like us, in whom nevertheless God's Glory shone forth.*

Now, says our Great Critick, Dr. Sherlock, this cannot be, that ἐγένετο should be render'd was Flesh. Why not? Is it not so ver. 6. *There was a man sent?* But, says he, 'tis never to be render'd was, when 'tis a Copula between a Subject and Predicate: and yet the good Doctor cou'd not perceive that in that very Text which he speaks of, the word ἐγένετο, is certainly (tho he did not understand it) a Copula between ἀνθρώπος and ἀπεσχημένος, which last Word is the Predicate, and no part of the Subject. I don't think the Doctor has any good luck either at Criticisms in Greek, or Speculations in Divinity, to encourage him to go on, after so many Stumbles.

But because 'tis endless to be capping Texts, while we fix not a Rule of interpreting them, but each expounds 'em according to his preconceiv'd Hypothesis; therefore to come to some Issue of the Controversy, 'tis necessary to fix on some Principles agreed on both sides, and by them to take our measures, in interpreting Texts that are of variable Accommodation, unless the Sense be determin'd by the Nature of the Subject. And this is the best way to find in what sense the Name of God is intended, whether for a Supreme or Secondary Power (for naturally 'tis no more one than the other, as the term Lord among us) and what Creation is intended, Old or New, and what Worship, &c. when attributed to Jesus Christ.

To this end I will lay down the Doctor's own Rule for expounding Scripture, and observe it with his own Limitations.

His

His Rule for expounding Scripture, when we appeal to it for Decision of any Question, is this; viz. to confine our selves to the plain and natural Signification of the Words. And tho he says, his Adversarys will oppose this with all their might; and if this be once admitted, there is an end of Socinianism: Yet he is much mistaken, they'll freely give him this imaginary Advantage, because they judge the fair obvious Sense of Scripture is for the Unitarians, and against their Opposers. I'll seek no more Liberty in going off from the natural Sense of a Text, than the Doctor himself allows in his Explication of his Rule. For,

He grants, we may recede from the obvious literal Sense, when the nature of the thing will not allow a proper literal Sense; P. 65. That it would be absurd to understand some things literally; and that the way to know what is a Metaphor, and what not, is from a previous Knowledge of the Nature of the things to which they are apply'd. So that if the Unitarians can shew, that the Nature of a deriv'd Being will not admit the Title of Supreme God, or First Cause, then they have his leave to deny the Title of Supreme God to J. C. from a previous Knowledge of his Nature, that will not admit it. And indeed to argue from the Nature of the Subject, is better than to argue from a thousand dubious Texts; because they must all be determin'd in their Sense, from That, at last.

Nay, I will not only close with his Rule, but I will approve his Example too, by which he illustrates it. When we read of the Face, Eyes, Ears, Hands of God, says P. 66. he, we know all this must be expounded to a metaphorical sense, because Reason and Scripture assure us God has no Body. So then, if it can be made appear, that the Unitarians have as good reason to reject what the Doctor accounts the literal Sense of the Scripture, as to the Trinity and Deity of J. C. as he or his Party have for rejecting the Opinion of the Anthropomorphites, or of God's having a Body; then it must be granted that they act justly, and offer no more Violence than the Doctor himself, and other Trinitarians. And upon this point I will join issue with him, and:



and leave it to impartial Men to judg whether the *Unitarians* have not better reasons for denying the *Supreme Deity* of J.C. than the Doctor, or the *Trinitarians* can pretend for denying God to *have a Body*, upon their Principles.

First, I am afraid, tho the Doctor rejects the Opinion of *God's having a Body*, with great disdain and positive assurance; yet upon his *Trinitarian* Principles, he has no reason at all for so doing: but is bound to hold that gross Notion along with the Opinion of the *Incarnation of the Supreme God the Son*, by a *personal Union to a Body*; because this last justifies the other. Where one Text is alledg'd for the *Incarnation of God the Son*, I suppose a thousand may be brought to prove bodily Members to belong to *God the Father*, of old. The Doctor owns, there is full Testimony; only he says, *Reason and Scripture* warrant his quitting the literal Sense, and assure us that *God has no external Shape and Body*. But I deny the Scripture says any such thing directly; and as to Reason, by his Principles, it cannot be against that Opinion neither.

1. Where does the Scripture say God had *no Body*? Does it not say he had *Face and Eyes*, &c. but never says he had none? It says indeed, *God is a Spirit* (tho but once, *John 4. 24.* where the Sense is doubtful too) but what then? May he not be an *embod'y'd Spirit* for all that, as Man is? Sure the *Anthropomorphites* may allow God to have a Spirit to animate his Body, as well as Men have. So that the Doctor seems but to pretend to join Scripture with *Reason*, that he might not be thought to rely on *Reason alone*, in thwarting the literal Sense of so many thousand Texts.

So that I doubt Reason must take the matter wholly upon it self, to maintain that the Deity (tho said to have almost all the bodily Members under the Old Testament) was not an *incarnate embody'd Spirit*, or personally united to *Flesh*. But shall proud Reason so correct Revelation? And that not in one single Text, but in the current Strain of Scripture: And these Texts so plain (may some say, after the *Trinitarian* Dialect) that God must needs intend to be

be understood in that obvious Sense, or to deceive us in a very great Point, by speaking contrary to the known use of Words. What! cannot the *Trinitarians* humble their Reason to so many clear Texts? What tho it seems harsh, has not God said it, and is not that enough? How know they how far he can separate all Imperfection from a Body, tho their *shallow Reason* cannot comprehend it? This is just such *Pride of Reason* as they charge on *Unitarians*, but yet damn and persecute 'em for it; while on their own side 'tis no Crime at all.

But the worst of it is, I don't see how Reason it self can help the Doctor in this case neither: I mean according to his *Notion* of a personal Union of the *Divine Nature* in J. C. to a human *Body*; because this Opinion has exactly all the *Absurditys* (at least as great as any) which he can charge upon the *Anthropomorphites*. And if his Reason can admit 'em all in the one case, why should it be affrighted with them in the other? This is but mere *Humour*, not Justice nor Reason. Therefore,

2. How can Reason assure the Doctor, or any of his *Party*, that God has not had a *Body* all along from the first? If nothing but utter Impossibility must drive us to a figurative Sense of the Text, how can they pretend it impossible for God to have bodily Members? For they can never demonstrate any Impossibility in it; but contrariwise do declare it to be possible: nay more, that the *Divine Nature* actually is incarnate, is made *Flesh*, and had *Blood* to shed in the second Person, and why not in the first Person before? Is it more impossible for God the Father to have a *Body* all along, than for God the Son to have one for ever, when both are said to be the same *Divine Nature*? Either 'tis an eternal Contradiction to true Reason for God to have a *Body*, or 'tis none at all; for true Reason is ever the same. And therefore,

The *Trinitarians* Mouths must be for ever stopt here; they must not talk of the Imperfections that attend a *Body* or the like: for since they say there is no Imperfection in it, that hinders the *Divine Nature* in the Son from being incarnate, by a personal Union to a *Body*; why should it



hinder the Incarnation of the *same Nature* in the Father? None need plead for more in the case, than that God the Father, under the Old Testament, has all along been *personally united to a Body*, as nearly as God the Son is said to be so under the Gospel, by the *Trinitarians*.

One Opinion is as defensible at the Bar of *Reason* as the other, as well as by *Scripture*. So then either let the Doctor confess he has no reason for denying the *Incarnation of the Father*, at least under the Old Testament; or let him justify the *Socinians* in denying the Incarnation of any *Divine Nature in the Son* under the New: since they must needs have as good Reason on their side, as the Doctor on his. Renounce *both*, or hold *both Opinions* together, since they are so much alike: and for shame cease clamouring against the *Unitarians*, and reproaching them with straining the *Scriptures*, while you imitate 'em to the utmost; and but for the very same Practice (*viz. putting the most easy and rational Sense upon the Scriptures*) you cannot avoid turning *Anthropomorphite* and *Muggletonian*.

Here the *Unitarians* might rest, as having said enough to justify their Procedure, by an Argument *ad hominem*; but *ex abundanti*, they can shew more solid and direct Reason still, why they renounce the Doctor's Notion of the Trinity and Supreme Deity of J. C. and much greater than he can shew, upon his Principles, for refusing to be an *Anthropomorphite*. I'll tell him some of their Reasons, even such as he must own to be pertinent, if made out.

First, they judg it very hard to suppose a *deriv'd Being* to be the most High God. The Doctor owns J. C. to be a *begotten Being*, a *distinct substantial Person*: and when he tells us, that *whatever Difficulty there is in conceiving a Trinity in Unity*, yet there is none in the Notion of God's having an *Eternal Son*; he must mean a *distinct substantial Son*, tho of the same *specifick Nature*: for else it is as great a Difficulty as that of the *Trinity in Unity*, if I must conceive the *same single Substance* to be an *underiv'd Father*, and yet a *begotten Son*. Two such Persons in the *single Unity of Substance*, is as hard to conceive as *Three*, or more such: But if he meant that the Son is a *distinct Substance*, begotten of

of the Father, then 'tis not indeed hard to conceive God's having a Son, but 'tis very hard still, to believe this begotten Son to be the very God, whose Son he is; or to be the Supreme God, or *First Cause*, when his Being is deriv'd from a Father.

For whether Modal and *Nominal* or *Real* Trinitarians, they generally own that our Lord J. C. derives his *Divine Nature* from the Father. The Notion of a *Son* implies it; the Primitive *Fathers* declare the Father to be the *Fountain* of the Son's Deity, and some of 'em expressly say he was the *Cause*. The Doctor grants this, and Dr. *Whitby* abundantly discovers it, in his Comment of *John* 14. 28. that the *Son* receives his *Divine Nature* dependently from the Father; and Mr. *Boyse* in his *Vindicat.* p. 80. says, his *Divine Nature* is deriv'd. In short, 'tis the Catholick Faith of the *Trinitarians* in the *Nicene Creed*, which is the Standard of their Orthodoxy, and a Part of the constant publick Worship, and subscrib'd to by *Dissenters*, That he is *God of God*; not Son of the Father, to denote the Relation, but *God of God*, to denote the *Divine Essence* or *Nature* to be deriv'd, as *God*; i. e. his *Divine Nature* of the *Divine Nature* of the Father: So that whoso denies the Son's *Deity* to be deriv'd, declines from the common *Nicene* Faith (and sets up a novel Doctrine) as much as the *Unitarians*.

Now here the *Unitarians* find matter of Objection: They think, as the Doctor in his sober moods says, That the P. 128. most natural Notion of God is, that he is the *First Cause*. But then how can he be the *First Cause*, who (as all Sides grant) is a *caused* deriv'd Being from another Cause? Can He be possibly more than a second Cause, who has a Cause of himself? The universally receiv'd Notion of a God among Men is, that he is absolutely the *First Unoriginate Cause*; and 'tis only by demonstrating such a Being, that I can prove a *Deity*. We must trace remote Effects up to a *First Cause* that is self-existent: and should we argue with an *Atheist* to prove a God, 'tis this we must drive him to. But if we tell him only of one whom we confess to be but a *begotten Son*, deriv'd of his Father; he would justly reply, that this is not to the purpose, for proof of what



Mankind mean by a God. There may be still an eternal Succession of Causes, if the highest Being I can pretend to, be but a *begotten Being* (and if Christ's Being be the highest Essence, then the highest Essence that we acknowledg, is but a derived one) and so the *Atheist* can never be confuted this way. No, I must find another Being who has the *Self-existence* and Independence, which J. C. is not pretended to have by the Doctor himself, or I am still to seek for my ultimate End, in whom to rest my Mind.

So that there is no good Proof of the Deity, without *Unoriginate Self-existence* : and then how shall I prove J. C. to be that Deity, if he has not that Perfection? To prove him to have *all Power and Wisdom*, &c. does not do it, if it be such only as a deriv'd Being may receive; and also if it come from a higher Fountain and Cause. *Self-existence* then being the most peculiar, and most *indisputably Divine* Perfection, and essential to the Deity, I would fain know, whether *he* be the most absolutely perfect Being, who wants this most *certainly Divine* and noblest Perfection? Nay, the Doctor has told us, that *an infinite Being signifies a Being that has all possible Perfections—and that is a finite imperfect Being, that wants any Perfections. Vindicat. of Trin. p. 78.* So that he must either shew, that *Self-existence*, and prime Causality, and absolute Independence is *no Perfection*, or else must grant that the *Son* who is not self-existent and independent, does want a glorious Divine Perfection—and then by his own Confession, *That is but a Finite Being which wants any Perfections.*

To say the *Son* is equal in other things, but not in this, is to give up the Cause: 'tis the same as to say, that he is not the *same Nature*, but *specifically different*, not having all the same essential Perfections as the Father; not so Honourable or *Amiable*; being inferior to him upon the whole, but yet as like him as *another inferior Being can be*, which is plain *Arianism*. For every Exception of a Perfection is a *Limitation*, and a limited Being is not the most *High*. Men may talk and write against the *Unitarians* to the World's end, and to no purpose, till they answer this Objection; for 'tis here the matter sticks, and in this they triumph, as *unanswerable.*

And

And this I rather urge, because 'tis according to the Doctor's own Rule, who tells us, *that from the previous Knowledge of the nature of the Subject*, we must learn what Sense to give to Expressions and Characters that are apply'd to it. Here then we have a *deriv'd dependent Being* under consideration; the question now is, in what sense the *Title of God*, and other Characters can be apply'd to him? Whether the Title of *Supreme God*, or of *Subordinate*, be intended? If it be not therefore consistent with a *derivative dependent Being* to be the Supreme God or the *First Cause* (which the Doctor says is our most natural Notion of God) then the Unitarians act most wisely, in not applying that Character of God to *him* who is a *deriv'd Being*, in such a high sense as the *Nature* of the Subject will not admit; and therefore it must be in a subordinate Sense.

Both Sides agree in it, that the Son is a derivative Being: So that all the Titles of *God*, *Lord*, &c. and the Attributes of Power and Knowledge, Worship, and Works of Creation, &c. must be so understood as they are capable of belonging to such a *deriv'd Being*. We must not from uncertain *Titles* and *Names* think to determine what the Subject is (which is to come in at the Back-door, a more obscure way) when we can *a priori* prove that the Subject is not capable of such Names and Titles in the pretended Sense: 'tis but reason that the known nature of the Subject should rule and limit the Sense of uncertain Names and Characters, &c. rather than equivocal Names and Words should rule the Subject, or be brought to force upon it what 'tis well known it cannot bear. Such Worship, such Power, &c. as a dependent deriv'd Being is capable of, is all that the Scripture ascribes to him. 'Tis much easier to suppose a *subordinate Being* to have subordinate Power and Worship, and the names of God in a subordinate Sense, than to suppose a derivative begotten Being to be the Supreme God: The Unitarians think the first, and the Trinitarians the latter, and more absurd.

'Tis therefore a pleasant Fancy in the Doctor, to challenge us to prove, *That the one God is but one Person, any otherwise than as the Father, who is the Fountain of the Deity,* P. 56.  
 who



who begat a Son in his own Likeness [not in his own Sameness, but it seems as Adam did, Gen. 5. 3.] is call'd the only True God. That is, we may not prove there is but one Person that is God, from this prime essential Perfection of Self-existence, which 'tis granted belongs but to one Person: which is just the same as to say, we must not prove it by that which is the most evident, and perhaps the only way to find out what Person is most High God. But why should he think us such Fools to let go our best Arguments, and then to try if we can prove our Cause without 'em? No, Sir, first do you shew us, that this is no necessary essential Perfection of the Supreme God, to be *self-existent* or *uncaused*, and then we will hearken to you; but till then, you seem to own that we have an Argument of force enough to baffle all you say, and therefore you'd craftily persuade us to quit it. I'm sure he is a noble and glorious Being, who is so necessary and excellent as to be without an Author or Cause: for being of none, he has none to limit his Being; and therefore must have Fulness of infinite unbounded Perfection. Whereas a deriv'd Being may possibly and easily be limited by his Cause or Author: and unless God can cause and produce or beget (for there is no great difference which) another infinite Being, who also is God, it must needs be so limited.

In short, the Great *Jehovah* disdains that any should be thought or said to have given to him; Rom. 11. 35. *Who has given to him?* Will our Lord *Jesus* make that absolute Challenge, who says that his Father had given him all? or will he equal his deriv'd receiv'd Being and Perfections to the Father's, who gave it? when himself us'd that *Maxim*, That 'tis more blessed to give, i. e. more excellent and worthy, than to receive, Acts 20. 35.

Nay, I find the Apostle arguing this Point with great Authority and Evidence, 1 Cor. 4. 7. *What hast thou which thou hast not receiv'd; and if thou hast receiv'd it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not receiv'd it?* What if some one (tho with great Veneration for the only begotten Son of God) should apply this to the Blessed *Jesus*, who is worthy of the Glory and Honour he is exalted to; and say, what is

is or hath he, which he hath not receiv'd ? and if he hath receiv'd it, why should any boast as if he had not receiv'd it ? or as if he did not owe Respect and Duty to him who gave him all ? How would this be answer'd ?

Here is no straining of Scriptures, or the natural Notions we have of things ; no artificial Subtiltys in these Reasonings ; 'tis plain, serious, honest and cogent Argument, which the Doctor, or any other, is desir'd with like Plainness and Fairness to give an answer to, as soon as he can. Till this be done, we shall think we have much greater reason for denying his strain'd Interpretation of some Texts for the Deity of Christ, than he has for denying God to have *bodily Members*.

The Sum of all is: 'Tis *essential* to the Divine Nature to be *Unoriginate*. The Question then will be, how *he* can have that Divine Nature, who being a deriv'd *Being*, wants what is essential to the Divine Nature ? Or how can he have the *Essence* who wants what is essential to it ? For to want what is essential to it, is the same as to want the *Essence*, and he who wants it has it not. I dare not say, Almighty God is a *deriv'd Being* ; but if J. C. be the Almighty God, and his Divine Nature be his *Father's Nature*, will it not follow, that the *Almighty Father's Nature* is deriv'd, because it is the deriv'd Nature of the Son *that is the Father's* ? And so being but one Divine Nature, *and this deriv'd*, there will be no unoriginate Divine Nature, unless we speak Contradictions, and say the same is unoriginate, and yet is caus'd and deriv'd.

Secondly, the *Unitarians* judg it to be very clear, that *God Almighty is but one Person*, or He. The Doctor challenges 'em to prove from Scripture, that *the one God is one single Person*. Now it must be known, that by a *Person* he fairly means a distinct *substantial Person* or *infinite Mind* (as all the World, I believe, out of this Dispute do, and the antient Church did) and by *three Persons* three infinite Minds, as he has declar'd in his *Vindic. of the Trin.* to which he refers us in this Book. He is rightly sensible, that to make a Trinity of *Modes* is but a Juggle, and Blind for *Sabellianism*, &c. since neither *Sabellius*, nor *Arius*, nor *Socinus*



*Sacculus* would ever deny such three Modes, or God's *Self-knowledge* or *Self-complacence* with *Original Mind*; nor had they been ever the nearer to the Churches Communion for owning it. And since all the common Arguments from Scripture, viz. from *personal Notes*, *I, Thou, He, &c.* do prove three Persons in the vulgar Sense, or prove none at all; because they were never in this world us'd to be put for *Modes* of one Person, and therefore could never be design'd by God in such a strange Sense; I say, he is just in his Notion of such a *Person*.

But it seems the easiest thing of many, to prove there cannot be *two Infinite Minds* or Beings, or that God is but *one such Person*; else there is no Supreme Mind or Spirit that can say truly, *I am, and there is none besides me*. Sure no more is God than what is necessary Being; but if one Infinite Mind be all Perfection (else 'tis not infinite) then no more is necessary. Again, if there be but one *Person* that is *First Cause*, or that has the Divine Essential Perfection of Independent Self-existence, then there can be but one Person who is God; since the Doctor grants, that our most *natural Notion of God* is, that he is the *First Cause*.

I know his Expression of *one solitary Person* seems to imply, that Plurality is requisite for *delicious Society*, lest it be not good for God to be *alone*; as if that *Glorious Ineffable Being* were indigent like one of us, who need social Help, or as if he was not to himself instead of a *Thousand*: and if there must be Provision against his *Solitude*, why not three hundred rather than three Persons? What do Men think of the Great God, who argue at this rate? No wonder, if they think not *one such Person* enough for their Happiness, who is thought not sufficient for his *own*.

The Doctor tells us, *each Person in the Trinity has the Perfection of the whole Trinity*. Then I think one is as good as all three, and the rest seem to be made by him utterly unnecessary; and what is so, is not essential to God. And if all Perfections are common to the three, then how can they be distinguish'd by any Perfections? And if not distinguish'd by some Perfections, how are they at all distinguish'd? If no way distinguish'd, how are they *three distinct Persons*?

*Persons*? But if they are distinguish'd each by some Perfection, then *one alone* has not all Perfections, and so has not the Perfections of the *whole Trinity*; nay, is but a *Finite Being*, according to the Doctor.

But perhaps he likes not that we should reason upon the matter; but only bring *Scripture Proof*: to that therefore I come, and shall see whether the *Scripture* does not warrant us to say that God is but one *single Person*. Do we not find God represented to us here, constantly under personal Notes of the *singular Number*? When he speaks to Men, 'tis *I* and *Me*; *Thou shalt have no Gods before me*, not *before us three*; *I am thy God*, not *we are thy God*. When spoken unto, is it not always *O Thou*, is it ever *O Ye*? When spoken of, 'tis said *He*, never *They*. Now the Doctor tells us, that *I* signifies a *Person*; so then complete God is but one singular Person or *I*. P. 222.

And thus we read, that *God is one*, *Deus est unus* — Gal. 3. 20. Jam. 2. 19. God is not said to be *by one thing*, in the Neuter Gender, but *one* in the Masculine; i. e. one Person *Unus*, not *Unum*: which is quite against the common Dialect of the *Trinitarians*, that say God is *alius & alius*, but not *aliud & aliud*; for if he be but one, or *unus*, then he is not *unus & alius*, or divers Persons. Now, how dare any say, that God is *Three* in the Plural, when the *Scripture* declares him to be but *One* in the Singular Number? And when it speaks but of *one God*, it limits it expressly to the *Father*, 1 Cor. 8. 5. as the *one Lord* (or subordinate intermediate Agent, as 'tis there intended plainly) is limited to *J. C.* So John 17. 3. *Thee (Father) the only True God*, as distinct from *J. C.* sent by him.

Perhaps some will run to the old trifling Remarks upon Gen. 1. 26. *Let Us make Man*, to prove a Plurality. But as that is frequent for one Person to use the *Plural*, which has an Air of Authority in it, and I doubt not but it might be so us'd then, as well as now: So if *Elohim* be of plural meaning at all, it must signify a *Plurality of Gods*; if the Singular be *one God*, then the Plural must be more than one God. And if a Plurality of Persons will not warrant us to



say *Gods* in the Plural, then neither was that the reason of saying *Elohim* or *Gods*, in the *Hebrew*.

But 'tis very apparent that was not the Intent of such Expressions (viz. to teach us a Plurality of Persons in God) because they are only us'd, and but rarely neither, in the Old Testament, where 'tis confess'd the Doctrine of the Trinity was not explicitly reveal'd; but they are never once us'd in the *New Testament*, of which 'tis pretended that Doctrine is the Fundamental Article. To us *Christians* he never speaks so; and sure he would have done it as fully as to the *Jews*, if he intended we should believe it more explicitly and fully than they, who understood it not. Sure 'tis in the Gospel we should find God using this Language, *We* and *Us*, and others in their Addresses saying, *Ye*, &c. if ever that had been design'd to express a Trinity: for no Proof had been more clear, nor any Stile more natural than this current way of Speech, supposing God to be *Three Persons*. So that 'tis evident it was but an *Idiom* of Language, and has no Argument in it, since the *New Testament* shuns all such Stile, where yet it had been most proper for that purpose.

Nay the using the singular Notes *Thou* and *He*, quite overturns the other; because tho some single Persons may assume an Air of Majesty sometimes, and say *We*, and yet none suspects more than one to speak it; yet never was it heard that three Persons in proper speaking should affect a diminishing Form of Speech, or say *I*. for by that none will ever suppose more than one Person intended. So that 'tis as evident as can be, that the Scripture, especially the *Christian Revelation*, speaks God to be one singular Person: whereas *Three Persons in one Being* had been so strange a matter, that the most particular Care and Accuracy of Expression, had been necessary to be us'd, if that had been to be reveal'd to our Faith.

So that all that is in God, is intended and comprehended in one single *He*, and one single *He* cannot be three *He's* or *They*. 'Tis not *Ye* or *They* are God, but *Thou art God*. The Unity of Essence had been secure in saying *God* in the singular Number, but the personal Notes must have

have been plural, if a Trinity of Persons had been design'd.

It signifies nothing to say there are *Three Persons* or *He's* that have the *Name of God* given 'em (tho of one 'tis never prov'd at all) for that may be in different Senses of the *Character, God*. And since the Supreme God is but *one He*, the other *He's* must not be *that* God, whatever Character they have. 'Tis easier to suppose there may be *Gods* that are not the most High God, but in another Sense; than that there should be *Three He's* or Persons in a God who expressly says he is but *one He* or *Me*; but one *Spirit*, John 4. 24. not three Spirits: The one is possible or obvious from Scripture, the other seems not possible, nor is it asserted.

But because the Doctor requires that we produce a Text which teaches that *J. C. is but a mere Man, and a God by Office*, we shall proceed to this; tho there is no necessity we should do this: For why should any suspect that a mortal Man should be the Supreme God, that we need prove *this Negative*? Where is there a Text that teaches us that *Moses* was but a Man? 'Tis enough that he was a Man. So that *Jesus* was a Man is plain, and that he was *anointed God* is plain, *Heb. 1. 8, 9*. But what need is there to have it said he was no more, if none then suppos'd that an anointed God was the same as the *Supreme God by Nature*? For then why need he, or how could he be anointed or commission'd by another? However, to gratify him, let us try if the Sacred Text does not declare *J. C.* not to be God by Nature, by denying absolutely that he has Omniscience, and ascribing some Ignorance to him as the *Son of God*, which will appear under the next Argument. For,

Thirdly, the *Unitarians* offer another Reason from *Mark 13. 32. Of that Day knows none* ('tis not *Man* in the Original, as the Doctor implies) *not the Angels, nor the Son, but the Father, or my Father only*, as 'tis *Mat. 24. 36.* for both Expressions are the same in Sense, and *none but my Father*, is as much a Limitation, as *none but my Father only*. Hence the Doctor forms a good Argument: *To be ignorant of any*



- P. 198. *one thing, cannot be reconcil'd with a perfect Knowledg — and were he true and perfect God of the same Substance with his Father, he could be ignorant of nothing. Very true! but how does he answer the Text that says, the Son knows not of that Day, but the Father only? Why, truly, he gives but the common Answer, viz. that he knew it not in his human Nature, but yet supposes that he knew it in his divine. Not that he likes that Answer neither, for he confesses 'tis very hard that the Son, who is but one Person, tho he have two Natures, should be said not to know what he did know, whether he knew it as God or as Man. But says he, in great distress, this must be the true Answer; why so? or, says he, I know not how we shall find a better: that is, we must use this very hard shift, or the Cause is utterly lost; and that must be maintain'd, whatever the Text says; and therefore tho we don't offer a good Reason, yet we must stand by what we have: A hard case indeed!*
- P. 199. *Then he falls on to blame his Ignorance of the personal Union, as the reason of this Nonplus; but why does he take up such a Notion of the personal Union, as the Scripture never asserts, and which he cannot reconcile with it? Does he not often declare that what belongs but to one Nature, is to be attributed to the Person? But now that it will not hold good upon due examination, but is turn'd against his Cause, he would pretend he does not know what the Union is. Is this fair? And if he know not what it is, how can he tell it would serve his purpose, if he knew it better? This is a poor Come-off. Why may not the Eutychians as well set up an unintelligible Mixture, as others an unintelligible Union?*

*Therefore the Doctor must try again, how to make good the old Answer, as well as he can. He tells us J. C. has two Understandings: How appears that? or what is it to the purpose, if he understand the Day of Judgment with neither? or how is either of them a Divine Understanding? Again, says he, J. C. opposes the Knowledge of Creatures only to that of the Father: Who denies it? But then the Unitarians say, the Son of God the Father is among them, who are oppos'd to the Father, and whom the Doctor accounts*

counts Creatures. For the Text says not Creatures at all, but mentions Angels and the Son; and if the Son was more than a Creature, then the Father were not oppos'd to Creatures only, when oppos'd to the Person of the Son, and I hope the Person of the Son is all that he is.

However, if the Son be not the *Father*, then where the *Father* only knows, and that as distinct from the Son, there the Son does not know; because he is no way the Father in distinction from the Son, to whom alone as so distinct, that Knowledg is appropriated: And 'tis in this the Argument lies, and not only in the Son's being said not to know it.

'Tis a vain Pretence of some, that the *Son and Spirit* are not excluded here, while yet they are forc'd to own, that by the Father is not meant *all three Persons*, but the *First of the Sacred Three*; and yet he only is said to know. Thus weakly and desperately I find a late Author argue, viz. Mr. J. Boyse in his pretended *Vindication of Christ's Deity*. To confute all this, let us but put his Comment in the place of the Text, and 'tis thus; *None, no not the Son, knows of that Day, but only the First of the Sacred Three*. Now one would think, that where the *First of the Three* only is excepted from being ignorant, the other two were not excepted; for then it could not be said *none but the First*, if the second and third also were excepted. So that this wholly gives up the Cause, as not to be vindicated; since it leaves the Son of God ignorant of something, which the Father knew.

As frivolous 'tis to say, that because he was call'd the *Son of Man*, Mat. 24. 30. therefore *only* the Son of Man, or his human Nature was intended in ver. 36. tho he had a divine. What, are there two Sons? Is not the Son of Man the Son of God also? If so, then 'tis the same Son under both names: Or supposing another *Son of God*, yet was there ever a *Divine Son* that was the Father, or *First of the Three*? If not, then is he excluded, let him be what Son he will; because all but the Father is excepted, whether Son of Man or *Son of God*. So that this poor Distinction and Evasion will not afford any Shelter. Nay, does



does not *Christ* say, *my Father only*; and if the *Father* be God, I hope then *his Son* means God's Son or *the Son of God*. So that 'tis as express as if he had said, *of that Day knows not the Son of God, &c.* for the Son of the *Father* was the *Son of God the Father*. So trifling a Defence only could the *Vindicator* make against so shining an Argument from the Sacred Text; but 'twas because he was in the Doctor's distress, *not knowing how to find a better*: and so they must speak Contradictions, rather than quit a weak Defence.

P. 201.

P. 263.

Well then they must go to the old Refuge: For, says the Doctor, *the incarnate Word being but one Person, whatever belongs to either Nature, may truly be affirm'd of his Person, tho it be not true with respect to more than one Nature*. Thus he says, *the Eternal Word was born and dy'd, &c.* but then if we may affirm of the Person what belongs to one Nature only, why should it not rather be said, that the *Son also knew of that Day*, if he knew it in one Nature? This is quite against him. In like manner, says he, *if Christ, as Man, was ignorant of anything, he yet knew, as God, he might truly be said not to know what he did not know, as Man*. But let him hold a little here: He laid the Rule down thus; *That we may affirm of the Person what was true of any one Nature*, and now instances in a Point that implies a Denial to the Person of what was true in one Nature. This is just contrary to his Rule; for there is a vast difference between affirming and denying in this case: and for the same reason that I can affirm a thing of the Person that respects one Nature, for that very reason I cannot deny the same thing of that Person, because to deny, is to say I cannot affirm it; and if I can affirm that *J. C. knew that Day*, then I cannot deny it without shameful Contradictions. Besides, if I may in absolute Terms deny of the Person what he is in one Nature, I doubt this would warrant Men to say in absolute Terms, that *Jesus Christ is not God*, nor better than a Creature, because in one Nature 'tis certain he is not more. So that this Shift won't do after all.

Now

Now if it appear, that the *Son of God* knew not all that the Father knew, then where is his infinite *Omniscience*? And if after all the large Expressions of his *knowing all things, and searching the Heart, &c.* it yet be found, that he has but a limited Knowledge, then I doubt all other Perfections ascrib'd to him in Scripture, will also be suspected to be in a limited Sense; since nothing is more largely ascrib'd to him than *Knowledge*: and if there be no Infinite Knowledge, &c. how is there an infinite Divine Nature?

I must not give over, without observing what the Doctor says at the end of this Argument; *viz.* that now the *Lamb, whole Christ, not as God only, but as Man, opens the P. 205. Seals, and discovers all those secret Counsels of God, with all the Variety of Events to the End of the World.* Again, says he, *his human Nature is perfected with the Knowledge of all the Divine Mysteries of Grace and Providence, &c.* Now I ask the Doctor, if this do not ascribe as much Knowledge to the Man Christ, as the Unitarians Opinion? And if so, with what face could he represent 'em for such ridiculous Monsters, in giving Divine Attributes to a Creature, when they say no more than the Doctor here does? Why did P. 6. he censure it as a Piece of *mysterious Nonsense* in them, to pray to one who cannot hear us, nor know what we pray for, unless God reveal it to him? Surely if his Human Nature know *all the Counsels of God* relating to the Government, Instruction and Support of the Church, and all the Variety of Events to the World's end, and be instructed in all the Secrets of Government; He may then very well know our Prayers, else he knows not *all Events*: And if the Doctor don't think the way of his knowing things by Revelation, or other way, to be *ridiculous*, I see not why it should be ridiculous in his eye, for a Man to pray to, or trust in him, as one who knows his Affairs so well, be it which way it will. If it be no *mysterious Nonsense* for the Lord Jesus to govern, as Man, by reveal'd Knowledge, how is it Nonsense to apply to such a Governour, as so qualify'd? Is he a Ruler of the Church by his Knowledge reveal'd to him, and may not a Subject of his trust in him, or



or, pray to him on that ground without *mysterious Nonsense*? Verily, this is *mysterious Confidence* or Ignorance!

Thus I have consider'd the Nature of the *Subject*, viz. J. C. that he is a *deriv'd* Being, and of God Almighty, that he is but *one Person*; and of the Perfections of J. C. that they are limited. Now it follows, that we must interpret the Texts of Scripture accordingly, which indeed fall in as naturally with the *Unitarian Scheme*, as with any, and with less violence than the Doctor offers, as appears by his hard straining with so little Success.

**F I N I S.**



36

A BRIEF  
VINDICATION  
OF THE.

**Bishop of Gloucester's**  
**DISCOURSE**

CONCERNING

*The Descent of the Man* CHRIST  
JESUS *from Heaven, &c.*

FROM THE

**Dean of St. Paul's**

**Charge of Heresy.**

WITH

A Confutation of his new Notion in his  
late Book of *The Scripture-Proofs of*  
*our Saviour's Divinity.*

---

London, Printed in the Year MDCCVI.



AND A BRIEF  
EXPLANATION

of the

DISCOVERY

OF THE

NEW METHOD

OF TEACHING

THE

ARTS



OF THE

NEW METHOD

OF TEACHING

THE

ARTS

A

T

time  
Are  
this  
our  
Fast  
here

tho  
Tri  
of  
nif  
Op

# A VINDICATION

## of the Bishop of Gloucester

### against Dr. Sherlock.

**T**H E Venerable Prelate, whose Discourse of the Descent of the Man Christ Jesus the Doctor so severely reflects on, is at least the second of our Right Reverend Fathers, who within a short time have been publickly accus'd of writing *Heresy* in the Article of the Deity of our Blessed Saviour. Alas! that this Point should be so dubious, as to be debated among our very Dignitarys to this day; and that our Reverend Fathers and Doctors can come no nearer in Agreement here than *Heresy* and *Truth*!

'Tis not long since the Reverend Dean proclaim'd all those guilty of *Heresy* and *Nonsense*, who believe not a Trinity of three distinct Infinite Minds and Substances, each of 'em a God: which other Reverend Doctors say is *Paganism*, and much worse than *Socinianism*. And tho that Opinion was censur'd as Heretical at Oxford, yet the

Vindic. of  
Trin. p. 98,  
99.



Doctor thinks he can find *Divines* enough to do the like by the Opinion of his Condemners.

- Pag. 229. Now again he charges a Reverend *Father's* Book, with asserting what *may shake the Foundations of all Religion, as well as of Christianity*, and with advancing an Hypothesis that *overthrows the whole Doctrine of our Salvation, and all our hopes of Immortality by the Incarnation and Death of Jesus Christ* — and yet *corrupts not the Christian*
- Pag. 273. *Faith, more than it does the Christian Worship*. And to render these Reproaches the more cutting, he tells us what an *old Friendship* and particular Respect he has for the
- Pag. 245. Bishop, which restrain'd him from some *Remarks* that else the Subject might bear. So that these are represented as the most favourable Remarks a Mind full of Respect for the Author cou'd in Justice make upon his Book.

How far Respect moderated the *Dean*, I shall not pretend to determine; but I find his Aggravations are far beyond his Proofs.

The Sum of the matter I take to be this. 'Tis a great Objection of some against the common Doctrine of the *Trinitarians*, that 'tis inconsistent with the Scripture account of *Christ's* Humiliation. The Gospel magnifies his Love to us in this matter as most transcendent, not only for the Sufferings he underwent, but also on account of the great Benefits and Glory which he laid aside in order thereto. *He emptied himself; and being rich, he became poor*, 2 Cor. 8. 9. Hereupon they inquire how any Man can rationally account for these things according to the common Notion of the Person of *Christ*? viz. That only his Divine Nature was before his Conception in the blessed Virgin, and that *then* the whole Human Nature Soul and Body began to be.

Now,

Now, says the *Arian*, perhaps, how could the Lord Jesus by this Account, *of rich become poor, or empty himself, or come down from Heaven*, and that by such a Descent as answers to his local Ascension? *John* 16. 28. *Ephes.* 4. 9. His Divine Nature could not descend, could not be stript of any uncreated Glory, for God cannot suffer Diminution; *he cannot deny himself*, being immutably perfect. And the Human Nature could not be made poor, that never had been richer, being born in Poverty, *in a Manger*; nor could it empty it self of Glory it never had. And if nothing was parted with upon our Lord's coming into the World, upon what ground do we extol the Love of our blessed Lord in *coming from Heaven*, and parting with his Glory, and emptying himself to become Man, &c.?

Nay, how could he possibly *come down from Heaven* answerably to his local Ascent, to which 'tis oppos'd so often? I find the Difficulty rather increas'd than remov'd by some that handle this Subject: among the rest, a very ingenious Person (tho a very sour Writer in these Controversies, and therefore ought to have been more wary) seems horribly confounded, I mean Dr. South (with whom the common Writers agree) who in his 3<sup>d</sup> Vol. of Sermons treats of this Subject.

Speaking of Christ's coming into the Word, he says, p. 366. *That 'tis impossible for his Divine Nature to come, because Coming is a Motion from the place where one is, to a place in which he was not before; whereas Infinity (the Property of the Divine Nature) implies a Presence to all places.* Well then, one would think if Jesus Christ came down at all, it must be in his *Human Nature*, for he has no other left to come. No, says he, p. 370. *That which did not exist before it was in the World, cannot possibly be said to come into the World, any more than*  
the



*the Fruit that grows on the Tree, can be said to come to the Tree; which would suppose it were somewhere else before. So then neither did the Human Nature come down, for he confesses it did not exist before the Conception in the Virgin, p. 317.*

But what way then did he come down from Heaven? The *Socinian* Sense of coming forth from God by virtue of his Commission, is ridicul'd as *forc'd*. Besides, then we should lose all those Texts, from whence Christ's Pre-existence was wont to be prov'd; and this would anger Mr. *Dean*, who says they are the *principal Proofs* of Christ's Divinity. But what then must be said in the case? Dr. S—h says, he came not down in the *Divine Nature*, nor in the *Human*, and gives seeming Reasons for it: and if neither Nature came down, I see not how he can pretend it of the whole Person. For tho we are sometimes told by the *Dean* and others, that by virtue of the personal Union, what belongs to one Nature only, may be attributed to the Person; yet I never can believe such a *Communication of Properties*, as that what belongs to neither Nature shou'd be attributed to the Person. This is a dark State of the Case!

But I must not forget to do this Ingenious Doctor this Justice, that between those Pages which contain these harsh inconsistent Matters, he has very conveniently plac'd a needful Caution, *viz.* that this Doctrine, *a. e.* of the Personal Union of two Natures in Jesus Christ, *brings both ends of the Contradiction together, p. 368.* and so he is safe; and no doubt with that fine knack he may explain any Mystery in the World, and need not fear to undertake *Transubstantiation*. But if this be the real case, that I must reconcile Contradictions, before I can have any rational account of the Love of Jesus Christ in coming down into this World,

World  
by su  
such  
whic  
him  
Jes  
ador  
A fir  
T  
ratio  
Jesu  
and  
here  
evid  
acco  
the  
and  
coro  
I  
som  
Hu  
swe  
Lo  
swe  
to  
Lo  
occa  
wi  
Sch  
ma  
an  
Bo

World, I think Christianity will not gain much Credit by such Explications and *Solutions*, any more than by such Assertions as that remarkable one, p. 316. ( in which no doubt the *Socinians* will cordially join with him ) *viz.* that his Faith in relation to the Person of Jesus Christ is such, *That*, as he says, *were it not to be ador'd as a Mystery, it would be exploded as a Contradiction.* A fine Issue of the Controversy!

The *Arian* thinks he gives a more intelligible and rational account of the matter by his Principles: That *Jesus Christ* did truly leave his former created Glory, and came down to live in Poverty on Earth; and that herein was great Love, because it was a very sensible and evident Loss and Humiliation. - And this gives a plain account of his *leaving Heaven* and his *Father's Throne*, and the like; which are Phrases continually in the *Mouths* and *Writings* of our Divines; but with what sense, according to the common Principles, appears not yet.

Now, I suppose, his Lordship thought to give us some ease in these Matters, by *another* account of *Christ's* Humiliation and Descent, that might more clearly answer to the Scripture, and raise a nobler Idea of his Love to Men than the common *diminutive* one; which swells high in words, but being examin'd into, seems to dwindle into little or nothing of real *self-emptying* Love. This might be his Lordship's design, and the occasion of his Discourse.

Next let us see what reason the *Dean* had to quarrel with it, or how he has mended the matter by his new Scheme or *Fancy*?

The Bishop asserts the Pre-existence of *Christ's Human Spirit*, which he supposes was first in Heaven, and left it, and its Glory there for a while; to live in a Body on this Earth; and some Texts at their first and most



most obvious view do certainly favour such a Pre-existence, if no subtle strain be used to evade it, as Joh. 3. 13. *The Son of Man was in Heaven.* Why should he name the Person by the Title from his Human Nature, if he intended to speak of what belonged to a Divine Nature, which perhaps none to whom he spake knew any thing of? So Joh. 17. 5. *Give me the Glory I had with thee before the World was.*

Nor had the Dean any reason to quarrel with the Bishop for rendring *ὁ ὢν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*, who was in Heaven, rather than *is in Heaven*; for as this leaves no difficulty in the sense, so 'tis agreeable to the Scripture use of the word. Is it not necessarily so render'd Joh. 9. 25. *I was blind, but now see?* *ὢν*, not *am* so. Does not Beza himself turn it, *Qui erat, who was in Heaven?* But forsooth, *This is no great Mystery*, says the Doctor; as if we must have nothing of Sense and rational Notions in Scripture, but Mysteries. And because he would not lose one of the number of his Texts in his common places for the Deity of Jesus Christ, therefore right or wrong the Doctor will be for the other sense, and hopes by standing stiffly for it he may do some Service, to such as mind the Number of Texts more than their Force. But it is well known the Socinians would not yield the Doctor's reading, if the Bishop had; and what had it signify'd to argue from a reading of the Text, which could not be prov'd to be certainly true?

Thus he finds fault with reading another Text, Joh. 8. 58. *Before Abraham was, I was*; and is so warm as to pretend that *ἐγώ εἰμι* must needs be *I am*, and that *I am* must be the peculiar Name of Jehovah. This he presses so far as to say, that to change *I am* for *I was*, is certainly to part with the most express Proof of our Saviour's

*Saviour's Divinity.* I am amaz'd that a great Dignitary shou'd tell the World, that this is *the most express Proof* he has for Christ's Divinity, *viz.* that he speaks thus of himself, *I am*; which is the ready way to expose a Cause by catching at Shadows instead of solid Arguments. Wou'd it prove the blind Man to be the *I am*, because he says the same words, *Joh. 9. 9. I am* he? And is it not us'd for the Preterperfect Tense, *I have been*, *Joh. 14. 9.*? And is the best Argument for Christ's Divinity gone with this slender Proof? This straining for Arguments never betters a Cause, nor does fair receding from an abused or doubtful Text weaken it. So that the Bishop has done no such harm to the Cause in these things as the Doctor himself.

The Bishop indeed has given up some Texts that used to be alledg'd for Christ's Deity, by proving his Pre-existence, and these the Doctor calls *most of the principal Proofs*. But what wou'd those Texts avail against the *Arians*, who own a Pre-existence (which is all that such Texts prove) and yet deny his *Deity*? But the Doctor shew'd that they prove a Pre-existence of a *Divine Nature*, else they are not the *principal*, nor any sort of Proofs to the purpose. This shou'd have been the Doctor's work if he had done any thing to purpose; the rest is but Clamour, to say they are good Proofs when others deny it, whether the Bishop had given them up or not. The Doctor only shews they may be consistent with a Divine Nature pre-existing, and so they may be with the want of it, or with another pre-existing Nature for ought he shews.

ibid. ~

Next he runs into Clamor against the Bishop's *Nestorianism*, but how does he make it out? Tho it be the Sum of all his Charge and Reproaches, yet his Lordship

B

never



never said the Human Soul was a *Person* of it self, without the *Logos* (whatever another accused Prelate has suggested) but that the *Logos* is personally united to the Human Soul, and by it to the Body. And where is the *Nestorianism* of this? Why, says the Doctor, he  
 Pag. 241. *always speaks in the Language of a personal Distinction*; for this he instances in his calling him the *Man Jesus*, and attributing so much to the *Man Jesus*, calling him *Lord and Saviour*, but never calling him the *Eternal Word*, &c.

But does the not calling *Jesus* *Eternal Word* amount to a denial that he is so? Or, does his calling him *Man Christ* deny him to be a Divine Person? Or does he say more of, or attribute more to the *Man Christ* than the Apostle? *One Mediator, the Man Christ*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. And God shall judge the World by the *Man Christ Jesus*, Acts 17. 31. Either the Apostle does hereby exclude the *Word* from being our *Saviour* and *Mediator*, when he attributes such things to the *Man Christ*, or else the Bishop does not exclude him in saying the same. Nay, does not the Doctor himself say, that the Title  
 Pag. 232. of *Son of Man* must signify the *Eternal Word made Man*, and notes the whole Person? And why then may not the Bishop call *Jesus* the *Man*, and speak of the *Merits* of the *Man Jesus*, and call the *Man Saviour*, and yet be allow'd to mean the same, viz. the *Eternal Word made Man*? especially when he had asserted the *Personal Union* of the *Man* to the *Word*: So that there could be no Person (with him) but the *Word* united to the *Man*, and the *Man* could be no Person, if the one Person consist of the two Natures. Where did *Nestorius* allow any *Personal Union*, as the Bishop? The making the Human Soul a Person as united to the *Word*, is far from making it another Person of it self, as the Dean

poorly

poorly argues. May not the Man say *I*, and the *Word* say *I*, and yet it be the same Person, according to the *Doctor's* Notion of the Union? Again, does it follow, that because the *Word* is only incarnate in the Incarnation of the pre-existent Soul, that it is not *incarnate* at all? yet so weakly he argues.

And what a ridiculous Remark is that, tho odious enough! where he says, *the only difference between the Arians and the Bishop is this, that they own no Word, or Son of God, but this excellent Creature, and the Bishop unites this Creature to the Eternal Word.* That is, the Bishop only differs from them in what was deem'd their Error. A sad Charge! just as if I should say, the only difference between the *Doctor* and the *Socinians* in this Point, is, that they hold no other Son of God, but the anointed *Man* Jesus Christ, and the *Doctor* unites this Man personally to the second Person of the Trinity. What would a captious Mind have!

I confess he gives a wonderful Argument against *Nestorianism*, that will charm any Man who is fond of Jargon. *This Nestorian Union, says he, is not the Union of the Human Nature to the Eternal Word.* He reckons if the Man Christ be a Person, he can be but a single Person; but if it be Human Nature, that is no subsistent Person of it self that is united to the Word, then it will be Human Nature in general will die and suffer, and be redeem'd, i. e. the Nature of all Mankind; whereas if the Man Christ was a single Human Person, only that particular Man might be redeem'd, but not Human Nature, or all Mankind. This I give as the Sum of what he says.

One would have thought any Man of Sense should have been asham'd to meddle with the imaginary Notion of *Universal Human Nature*, since so great a Man



as the Bishop of *Worcester* was gravel'd with it in his Debate with Mr. *Lock*. Would there have been less of Human Nature in our Lord for being a Person, as every Man else in the World is, and ever was? Had *Jesus Christ* any more than his own particular Human Essence, as every Man has his own particular, like indeed to others, but not theirs at all? Did every Man's Human Nature die when *Jesus Christ* died? or why might not his *Human Person* have been every Man's Person, as well as his *Nature* every Man's Nature? For my Nature is as particular as my Person. There is no such thing in the World as *Universal Human Nature* abstract from Particulars, 'tis but an abstracted Notion; all Human Nature is in Particulars. I conceive *Christ's* Human Nature was not the Doctor's, nor is the Doctor's Nature which he has here personally united to the Divine *Logos* in Heaven. Some Human Nature is to be damn'd, I hope *Christ's* Nature is not to be so. What Trifles does he put upon the World!

Besides, then *Christ* could not die *instead of all*, or any of Mankind, if he was all Human Nature or Mankind; but then it follows, that Human Nature dy'd and aton'd for it self, without a Substitute: and why should Human Nature perish at all, if all Human Nature has made ample Atonement?

These are terrible Arguments against *Nestorianism*; and unless the Doctor's Human Nature be all Human Nature too, I believe few of that Nature will be of his mind. What strange Notions are these to serve an *Hypothesis*! Men may talk big, and lay their Salvation on what odd Notions they will, but this never moves a wise Man to imitate their Ravings. But I'll say no more of this, because I hear his *Lordship* intends

tends  
resy.

Lo

all

the

take

Ansv

an I

ascen

will

by t

in o

in a

then

Div

perl

T

in a

Wo

in

pers

essen

of

eter

fore

Glo

Ete

ven

He

tur

nij

of

as

tends to vindicate himself from a Charge of Heresy.

Let us then go on, to see whether the *Doctor* has at all mended the matter, or given a better account of the Son's *coming down*, and *emptying himself*, so as to take off the abovesaid Objection of the *Arians*. For Answer to this, he owns *that 'tis a Mystery to him, how an Infinite Being that fills all places can be said locally to ascend or descend*. But yet for all the Text speaks it, he will venture to affirm, that *properly it cannot be* (where by the way observe, that what he calls a *great Mystery* in one place, he says is a thing that *properly cannot be* in another; there is his Explication of a *Mystery*) but then how does the Son of God descend, if not the *Divine* nor the *Human* Nature can come down properly?

To this he says, *When the Eternal Word, who appear'd in a visible Glory in Heaven before the Foundation of the World, came down, he put off for a time his visible Glory in Heaven, and left his Father's Throne, and made his personal appearance on Earth. — He put off, not the essential Glory of his Nature, but the visible Manifestation of his personal Glory in Heaven. His Riches were the eternal Glory he was possess'd of in Heaven, and therefore his becoming poor, was his putting off the visible Glory of the Son of God, &c. — Now when the Eternal Word translated his personal Presence from Heaven to Earth, he might properly be said to descend from Heaven.*

Thus, besides the essential Glory of the Divine Nature, he asserts a personal *visible eternal Glory, and Manifestation before the World was*, and that not by way of possible Supposition, but with peremptory Assertion, as if he personally had seen it. This is no presumptuous prying,



prying, I warrant you, into hidden Myſteries, as long as 'tis done on his own ſide! but as the *Hypotheſis* is as precarious wholly as that of *Socinus* about the Tranſlation of *Jeſus* to Heaven before his publick Miniſtry (for *John* 3. 13. is as good a Proof for *his* purpoſe as *John* 17. 5. is for the *Doctōr's*, I mean for Proof of a *viſible eternal* Glory of a Divine Infinite Perſon) ſo 'tis weak and abſurd on many accounts. For,

1. Was that viſible Glory a Creature, or uncreated Glory? 'Tis hard to ſuppoſe, he takes it for *uncreated*, ſince 'twas neither eſſential, nor neceſſary to the *Divine* Nature, for he grants it might be put off; and he makes it a Finite or limited thing, that may be confin'd to a place, and tranſlated from one place to another. Sure God cannot lay by any *uncreated* Excellency! or can any finite, viſible, ſenſible Object be uncreated? If ſo, then to prove the Lord *Jeſus* an uncreated Being, would not prove him to be Infinite, or of the Nature of God, becauſe ſomething *not created* would be *finite* and viſible. I will ſuppoſe then that there is no uncreated Being but God; and that what is viſible, finite, and mutable, is not God; and conſequently that the *Doctōr* will not ſuppoſe this limited, unconstant Glory to be uncreated.

Why then it muſt be a *Creature-Glory*: But was there any Creature before the World was? Nay, ſince he calls it *eternal* Glory, will he aſſert an *eternal Creature*? This will give up a ſtronger Proof for Chriſt's *Divinity*, than any the Biſhop has given us, *viz.* from his Eternity: for when his Eternity is prov'd, what avails it in Proof of his Deity, if there be eternal Creatures?

2. I aſk, Was this Glory perſonally united to the *Eternal Word* or not? If not, it was none of his Perſon.

Then,

Then, as the *Doctor* argues against the *Nestorian Union*, or the *Human Person*, not united to the *Word*, it follows that 'twas not *Jesus*, or the *Eternal Word* that came down, not *Jesus* that ascended again where *he was before*, but another Being, a Creature; and then his own Conclusion is, *The Foundation of our Hope is lost*. For 'tis the Union of the two Natures in one Person, that he makes to be the only ground of ascribing to the *Person* what belongs to *either Nature*, p. 266. as I could not ascribe to the *Man*, what belongs to the Body, if the Body was not in personal Union to the Soul. So that his visible Glory is no more the *Eternal Word*, than the *Nestorian's Man* is, if it be not in personal Union with it.

But if it was personally united to the *Word*, then it follows, that the *Eternal Word* was in personal Union with a Creature from Eternity, and long before he was *Man*; and that the *Word* was made *Light* or *Glory* before he was made *Flesh*: and so there will be two personal Unions, and three Natures in one Person, two Creatures, viz. visible *Glory* and *Flesh*, and a Divine Nature. Who will not say that the *Dean* has far out-done the *Bishop*?

3. I ask how, or upon what occasion should there be such a *visible eternal Glory and Manifestation*, when there were none to make this Manifestation unto, and to see this visible *Glory*? It was, I hope, no Manifestation to God, or the Divine Nature; God knew his own essential *Glory* without a Manifestation, and the *Dean* will at least allow the three Divine Persons to know their own personal Excellencies by a *mutual Consciousness*: so that this visible *Glory* seems of no use to them, and yet there were no others from Eternity that the *Dean* tells us of to see this visible *Glory*,



Glory, or to receive this Manifestation; therefore there is no reason to suppose such an unnecessary thing.

4. How could Jesus Christ put off this visible Glory for a time, so that he should not appear in it as he did before the World was? Was this Glory utterly extinguish'd and annihilated, or did it vanish and disperse into Obscurity? This indeed will shew it to have been a created Glory; but what ground is there to assert this, and to suppose a new one to be created when our Lord ascended? And how then was it *eternal*? or did it only move by *Translation* from place to place? Then it will follow that Jesus Christ had not *put it off*, nor emptied himself of the rich Manifestation he had before the World was, because wherever this visible Glory settled, it was manifest to as many as it had been formerly manifested to *before the World was*, that is, to the three Divine Persons: and if it could not be hid from these, then he made the same glorious appearance still that he had done from Eternity, and so need not have said, Give me the *Glory I had with thee*, but the *Glory which I have now with thee*, and never parted with.

Or did it return to Heaven again after such a transient appearance as at the Transfiguration? If it return'd, then Jesus Christ had as truly ascended before his Death as he had ever descended, *viz.* by a Translation of this *personal* Glory; and if it dwelt on Earth, being visible, it had been openly seen where he went, and it had not been his Humiliation neither, but his Riches and Grandure to have so come down in Pomp.

Nay, I doubt the Doctor must ascribe the like Descent and Humiliation to God the *Father*; for he says, that *God translated his personal Presence from Heaven*

to

to E  
mov'  
said  
make  
Wor  
T  
Asc  
the I  
Glory  
doub  
off h  
liatio  
cordi  
foll  
scenc  
A  
dow  
W  
if it  
the  
carn  
nobl  
I  
from  
with  
othe  
one  
othe  
A  
to b  
not  
so h  
exist  
as w

to Earth, when he descended on the Mount, and he re-  
mov'd it again; and that when he does so, he may be  
said to ascend and descend in respect of us: and he  
makes this an Illustration of the Descent of the *Eternal*  
*Word*. Pag. 230.

Then we have, it seems, the *Father's* Descent and  
Ascent as well as the *Son's*: and if it was a *leaving*  
*the Father's Throne* in the *Son*, and a *putting off his*  
*Glory* and *Riches*, when he thus came down; then I  
doubt not we must account the like to be his putting  
off *his* *Glory* too: and then there will be the *Humi-*  
*liation of God the Father* as great as of the *Son*, ac-  
cording to the Doctor's Notion. And will not the like  
follow in relation to the Holy Spirit, that once de-  
scended in his visible *Glory* on the day of *Pentecost*,  
*Acts 2*? And so after this rate all three will have come  
down and been humbled for us.

What a poor scanty narrow Creed is the *Athanasian*,  
if it wants all these Articles? If the Doctor had but  
the mending of it in the Points of the *Trinity* and In-  
carnation, according to his present *Hypothesis*, what a  
noble spacious thing might he make of it?

I am seriously ashamed to see such raw Notions  
from an ingenious *Dignitary* of the Church, urged  
with so much Positiveness and severe Reflections on  
others, not sparing his Reverend *Father*. This tempts  
one to use more freedom in the case than one might  
otherwise be disposed to.

And after all, allowing this wild fanciful *Hypothesis*  
to be good, how has he mended the matter? Or, has he  
not run into the same faults in the main which he  
so hardly censures in the Bishop? He is for a *pre-*  
*existent Creature* too to come down from Heaven for us,  
as well as the Bishop; and the *Eternal Word* no other-



wife comes down according to the Dean than in the Descent of the visible Glory: And he says as little of a *personal Union* of this pre-existent Creature to the Eternal *Word* as the Bishop, nay much less; only the Bishop makes *his* pre-existent Creature to be a *rational Agent*: And if the Doctor's visible Glory be but suppos'd rational (which would not render it less noble) then they come much to one and the same thing. At least, where was the need of all this Fierceness and Noise, where no more is done to set matters in a better light?

So that still it will be inquir'd, how will the Dean solve the *Arians* Objection abovesaid, without such or the like Concessions as his Lordship saw a necessity of making? And tho the Dean says 'tis by giving away the *principal* Proofs of Christ's Divinity, and thinks he comes too near the *Arians*, &c. yet our Question ought to be, not what Opinions are farthest from the *Arians* and *Nestorians*? but what are nearest to the Truth, and best explain the great Love of the Holy *Jesus* in the Gospel? and whether the Doctor's Notion of a bright appearance or *visible Glory's* removing from one place to another, be such a mighty matter as to fill up the *Emphasis* of such Texts, he *became poor*, and emptied himself. A Prince may lay by his *Robes* and be never the poorer, or emptier; if he don't lose withal some real Authority, or some of his *Dominions*, he endures no very grievous Change by not always wearing his glittering Crown.


In short, I don't find that the Doctor has added any Clearness to the *Scripture-Proofs* of our Saviour's *Godhead*, by his Examination of the Bishop's Discourse, but rather confounded the business of the Incarnation, as if he was resolv'd upon that score at least to shake hands

hands once with his Brother Dr. S—*th*; for they *both* by unintelligible Explications have expos'd the Cause to the *Arians*, and made sport for Infidels; who, God knows, need no more Stumbling-blocks in their way; and happy were it they would believe the *naked Gospel* of Truth, without regarding the distracting Explications of subtle Doctors, who have more Curiosity than solid Judgment, and are not near so impartial in searching after Truths themselves, as they are forward to cast the Reproach of Error upon others.

---

F I N I S.





*Remarks on Mr. Cha. Leslie's first Dialogue on the Socinian Controversy.*

S I R,

**I** Who am a true Scriptural Trinitarian, am far from rejecting as a Contradiction, any Doctrine that bears the genuine Stamp of Divine Revelation, merely because it has some Difficultys attending it which I cannot solve, or because I cannot frame an adequate Notion of it; nay, I firmly believe there is no Contradiction in the Scripture Account of the Holy Trinity, to the Divine Unity: But yet I must freely tell you, that I am no way assisted to answer the common Objections of that kind from what you offer towards clearing the vulgar Notions of a Trinity, from some Mens imputation of Contradiction and Inconsistency.

There may be Contradiction enough in the common Explications of that Doctrine, for ought you have said in the Matter. Nor have I ever met with less rational Satisfaction in the Point, than in your late uncharitable Dialogue. If such poor Philosophy, such shallow Reasoning, and such gross Divinity, must baffle the Socinians, I confess they ought to be the last who pretend to the Character of *Men of Reason*.

To their Charge of a Contradiction upon the Explication of the Trinity, you offer these things in your Defence.

1. Say you, *That may not be a Contradiction in one Nature, which is so in another*, p. 7. But here you greatly err; for a Contradiction always consists of two inconsistent Parts or Terms; and wherever those two Terms are united in any Proposition, 'tis always a Contradiction, let it be apply'd to what Nature you will. Indeed there may be something attributed to one Nature, where there is nothing inconsistent or contradictory to it; while if attributed

to another it might meet with something inconsistent, whence a Contradiction will arise in the one and not the other: but as one of the Terms alone is not the Contradiction in any Case, so where both the Parts are join'd (which is the Contradiction) 'tis always a Contradiction, and of the same size, in any Nature. I should indeed suppose you might mean thus, were it not for those ridiculous Instances you bring for the Illustration of your meaning, p. 8, 9. where you intimate, that tho' 'tis a Contradiction, for our *Legs to move two Yards as soon as one*, yet 'tis none for the *Eyes to reach a Star as soon as the Top of a Chimney*; or for the *Thoughts to go to Rome as soon as the next Street*: and gravely conclude, *Thus you see that what is a Contradiction to Legs, is none to Eyes nor to Thought*; and oft speak of the *Motion of Sight and Thought*: adding, that all the Philosophy in the World cannot reconcile its going *two Yards as soon as one*, from down-right Contradiction (for so you express it). But are you indeed so very weak as to think you move all the way to Rome, and are got thither as soon as you think of it? No, Sir, whatever hast you may be in thither, you go no faster than your Legs can carry you. And should you challenge all the Philosophy in the World? who have so little as not to know, that when you think of Rome, or any other Place, 'tis only the *Idea* of it in your Imagination which you contemplate, and not a Leap or local Motion of your Thoughts to it. In like manner, when we see the Stars, our Eyes move not up to them, but their extended Rays strike upon the Eye. I see you have a Head much fitter for entertaining and coin-  
ing Mysterys, than for explaining or  
defending



defending 'em. It's a wonder you did not think rather, that *Rome* and *Con- stantinople* shift and come into your Head: and then since in other Cases a lesser Vessel cannot contain a greater, nor a Nutshell hold an House: you might wonder how your little Head should hold such great Citys: and with the same Philosophy infer, that what is a Contradiction to *Nutshells* is none to *Heads*, and challenge all Philosophy to reconcile it.

2. You say, *No Contradiction can be charg'd in any Nature we don't understand*, p. 7. For which Reason, you say, we must not object Contradictions in the Incomprehensible Nature of God, from comparing it with our own. I should grant this, in an Object of which we have no Knowledge at all: but surely if I have some, tho a partial Knowledge of the Infinite God, I may discern what is contradictory to that little Knowledge of him. Nor is any thing more usual or just, than to deny such or such a Doctrine, because incomparable to the Divine Attributes, to his Spirituality, Eternity, Goodness, &c. though perhaps some of these are not plainer nor better known than the Divine Unity. So that one may as well perceive some things to be contradictory to the Divine Unity, as we do others to be so to his Purity, and Spirituality, &c. for why shou'd his Unity be thought the only obscure Attribute among Christians? And therefore there is no more Caution due here than in all other Reasonings from other Divine Perfections known but in part.

Nay, you your self frankly grant, that we may perceive some things to be a Contradiction when affirm'd of God: for you say, p. 6. that 'tis a Contradiction to say, *three Persons are but one Person*; and you are not ignorant (or if you be, you are not most fit to write in this Controversy) that the Unitarians take this to be the very case, viz. that you make *three Persons of one*

Person: whatever you say; for they imagine, that God Almighty, in the complicated notion of God, is but one Person, expressed by single personal Notes, *I, Thou, or He*. They fancy you pray to him as one Person, when you address thus, *O Thou Lord, &c.* They don't observe any to cry, *O ye hear us, &c.* But if that be your meaning, pray consider if you do well, by using the single Pronoun, to give 'em occasion to suspect, that you take God for one single Person, when you may so easily amend it, by saying always, *O Ye* in the Plural. They are ready to say, that when you prove the Son or Spirit to be a Person, you do it from such Personal Notes as shew each of 'em to be one *He*: and that if under one *He, Me, Thou, &c.* (by which God Almighty is perpetually express'd in Scripture) three *He's* are included (for instance, if the Words, *no Gods before me, mean none before us three*) then how shall they be sure, that under the Person of Son, or Spirit, tho spoken of as one *He* each, there may not be many Persons intended by you? Now you'll do well to shew, that God is not one *He* or Person, or that there are not three Persons in him in a proper Sense. Such as the Proofs some bring for the three Persons do mean, if they prove any thing. Without this you did not well in making so liberal a Concession, viz. that 'tis a Contradiction for three Persons to be but one Person, if you hold both.

3. You advance this odd Paradox, That if the Doctrine of the Trinity be a Contradiction, it could not be an Invention; annexing this shrewd reason for it, *For who could invent a Contradiction?* p. 24. as if no Error (which ever implies a Contradiction to some Truth) can be an Invention; whereas all Errors are nothing else but Inventions; and a Socinian will say, as you represent him, that you run into these Contradictions, by mistaking

**taking the holy Text.** Whether you do mistake it or not, or whether you get by the mistake or not, I meddle not; but 'tis a fair account, how 'tis possible and easy for Contradictions to be invented: and your saying you don't mistake the Text, be it ever so truly said, is not to the purpose, since they, believing you do mistake, can satisfy themselves how it might arise, and are no way tempted to think it better than an Invention, merely for its seeming to them a Contradiction.

But tho you have said so little to the purpose against the Objection of a Contradiction in the point; yet, as I said, I argue not upon that head, and therefore leave it,

To consider what Notion you'll give of the Trinity: for indeed till Men know *what Trinity* in God you mean, 'tis in vain to prove any more than a Trinity in general, which is not deny'd. You offer us some Parallels and Images to help our Conceptions, but very inconsistent ones. One while 'tis a Trinity like *three Faculties* of one Mind, and another while 'tis like a Trinity of three Men or Minds; which two are just as opposite as three Persons, and one Person, which you say is a Contradiction: so that both cannot be true Images of the same thing.

1. You resemble it often by three Faculties (that is, three Operations) of the one Soul, p. 14. where you say, *the Understanding is the Father Faculty; the Memory is begotten by it, and the Will proceeds from both.* This, you say, is an Image of the several Persons of the Deity, p. 30. Now tho you are out in your Account of the Nature and Pedigree of the Faculties, when you make the Memory another Faculty, which is but an Act of the Understanding, and so is no Image of a second Person; and when, supposing it another essential Faculty, you say, 'tis begotten by the Understanding Faculty, whereas 'tis only the Exercise of the Memory that the Understand-

ing can occasion, and not the Faculty, which is before any Act of the Understanding: yet when you have pleas'd your fancy ever so much, with these pretty Jingles; this is nothing to the Socinians, it only shews, how three Operations of a Mind may be in but one Person, not how three Persons may be in one Mind; unless the divine Persons are but so many Operations or Thoughts. Besides, they will ask such Allegorical Trinitarians (for I assure you in this Case, you are not charg'd with keeping too much to the Letter of the Text, as you pretend, p. 25. but too little, in making three such distinct Agents, as Father, Son, and Spirit, to dwindle into a thin Figure or *Proposopaia*) whether *Arians*, or *Socinus*, or any Unitarians ever deny'd such a Trinity: Were they such Fools as not to believe, God knows and loves himself? (And can't he do this without being 3 Persons, which is done by every single finite Person?) If this be eternal Generation and Procession, they are for it; and they have been barbarously us'd if this was all the Charge against 'em, which all know they were clear of, and that they believ'd God has somewhat answering to our three Faculties.

You pretend, p. 17. that notwithstanding the Unlikelihood of three Faculties to three Persons, you must yet use the term *Persons*, because we must not alter the Phrase of Scripture; and yet the Scripture has no such Phrase at all as three Persons in one God. Your alledging the Words, *the Image of his Father's Person*, is here impertinent for proof of three Persons in God; it only proves God the Father to be a Person, which none deny. Tho the word *ὑπόστασις* signify'd, then, *Substance* not *Person*, Heb. 11. 1. you of all ought to give a better reason than this for using the Terms, *three Persons*, of God; because (if I mistake not) at the end of Mr. G's *Deists Manual* you have said, that the word *Persons*, apply'd



*ply'd to God, is us'd in a Sense infinitely different from what it means when us'd of Men. Now if it be infinitely different, 'tis at the widest distance possible; and nothing can be more unfitly made use of than such Terms as express all the Unlikeness possible to the thing intended. 'Tis a ready way to deceive Men, to use terms that are the farthest off of any we can devise, from expressing the true meaning: 'tis better saying nothing of God, than what begets corrupt Ideas of him.*

However, will this sort of Trinity, like to three Operations of Man's Mind, accord with the Scripture Trinity of the Father, Son, and Spirit? who have such distinct Parts and Agencies assign'd 'em, as cannot be so much as shadow'd out by our three Faculties. You grant the Father was not incarnate, but the Son. Can the Understanding be incarnate, and sent, and humbled, &c. and not the Will? Are not the three Facultys always in the same human Mind, which is incarnate without Division? Do you teach us, that the divine Nature is incarnate, without its Understanding, or Father Faculty? No, there must be more Distinction than this between the *not-incarnate* Father and the incarnate Son.

Besides, don't you think the Son of God knows himself, and retains that Knowledge, and loves himself? And if so, then, according to you, he is the Person knowing, and the Person known, loving and lov'd, as you learnedly distinguish, p. 30. And this will make three such Persons in each Person, by reflecting on himself: for this seems to be your Argument, A Man knows himself, ergo he and himself are two Persons. And at this rate a good Wit may allegorize all the Absurdities of the *Alcoran* into fair Meanings, and silence all your Objections against it, tho the vulgar People be still left to their own gross Conceptions, while

they take the literal and obvious meaning: nor do you build upon such a Trinity, like that of three Facultys; for you have another Scheme which fits your Notions better. Therefore,

2. You resemble the Trinity by three human Persons in the same human Nature; but then lest the Socinians infer, that three divine Persons will in like manner be three Gods, as three human Persons are three Men, you will not allow it to be *strictly true, to say, Two or three Men*, when so many human Persons are spoken of, p. 6. but think there may be many human Persons in the *same one Nature*. And yet in short, you tell the Socinian, that if he would allow that several Persons might partake of one divine Nature, as he does allow they do of one human Nature, the Dispute was at an end, as to the Substance of it. But Sir, the Unitarians do not allow one and the same Nature to have many Persons in it; they judg every Man has a particular Nature and Substance of his own, in which none partakes, only that others have such another like Nature to his: they cry, human Nature in general is a mere *Ens Rationis*, a Notion of the Mind arising from the comparing one Man's Nature with another.

However, if three divine Persons be like three human Persons as to their Unity of Nature; then I doubt they will, in consequence hereto, be deem'd to be *three infinite divine Minds*, as three human Persons have three finite Minds, let 'em be ever so much one in their Nature, or Kind. And if three divine Persons should as properly be accounted three Gods, as three human Persons can (in strict Speech) be accounted three Men, and are as truly three infinite Minds or Spirits, as three Men are three finite Minds, there is a sad end of the dispute indeed. But on the other hand, if three Men

Men (or human Persons) in the same one single Nature or Mind, be a Contradiction, then you give the Unitarians too much occasion to think the like of your Notions of the Trinity, by making this Parallel.

Moreover, If God teach us to number Men by *two, ten, &c.* and yet in opposition to such Plurality, tells us, there is but one God, or rather that *God is but One, unus, or  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$* , it warns us that his Unity is inconsistent with such a plurality of Persons as is in your human Nature. You add, p. 17. *If we say, there is not more than one Human Nature, we cannot say, there is more than one Divine Nature, tho several Persons partake of it.* Now this shews your Notion of the Unity, which you sacrifice to that of a Trinity: and upon this Notion of several infinite Minds, your Scheme is built; as your Arguments for the eternal Generation of the Son, and Procession of the H. Ghost, do manifest: for you tell us, God must needs generate and produce other Persons on these accounts.

1. Because 'tis a Perfection in Man to propagate: p. 31. *We see Trees spring from Trees, Beasts, Fish, Fowl, and Man propagate their Kind; and shall God be barren?* say you, and hook in a figurative Text, *Isai. 66. 9.* according to the vulgar Translation, to back you; and truly you wanted a better Authority for such a Paradox. For you ought to know, that Man's Propagation is so far from being an absolute Perfection, that 'tis founded in his Infirmary; he need not be multiply'd, but for want of others to succeed him when dead, or to aid and assist him while living. And as Angels, who are more perfect, do not propagate, I suppose; so neither will Men, when they come to a more perfect State: this will cease with their present Imperfections. It seems then the nearer to God, the less there is of this Propagation.

But why must God be barren, for not propagating? Are not Angels and Men his Offspring? and he the Father of the whole Creation? Would you have the Almighty propagate as thick as the Trees? I doubt you'll think him else, to be comparatively barren. The reason you give for not multiplying Persons and Productions, or Communications in God [*viz. If it be infinite, it can be no more than one; and to infinite Productions nothing can be added; but human Productions may be repeated, because finite*] should be consider'd as it seems to lie against any infinite Production in him at all. For it may be objected, that many infinite Productions are no more absurd than many infinite Persons; and that if infinite Person may be repeated, and can have an Addition, why not other Infinities?

2. Because God would be stinted in his Happiness, if there were not a Person (you must mean another Person) to communicate all his Thoughts to; and this must be an infinite Person, for say you, nothing but infinite can contain infinite. See more to this purpose, p. 32. And a little before, you argue for your point, from Man's want of some to converse with; else his Life is a Burden, say you. *Who would be content to live, if there was never a Man in the World but himself?* Such a solitary indigent Being you suppose a great Jehovah to be, that without Company he cannot be happy. What a base ignoble Notion is this of that perfect Being? as if infinite Wisdom and all Perfection cou'd want any thing more! and can't be happy, unless it be multiply'd into two Minds. Thus you make him barren indeed, while you talk of the divine Fecundity; and tempt the Unitarians to think, that three such Persons as you would make 'em, are not so great as their One, *Self-sufficient, Eternal Mind.*

By



By these things you discover your Mind plainly, that you are for three infinite Minds or Spirits; and that by the divine Generation of a Son, you don't mean only his *Self-Reflection*, but a Production of another infinite Mind: for otherwise you talk inconsistently; nor is there any shadow of resemblance between Man and God in the case which you argue upon. For you can't mean, that Man is solitary and miserable for want of conversing with his own Mind, but for want of another Man to discourse with: and accordingly must mean, that God could not be happy neither, without another infinite Mind. Nor does any deny him to contemplate himself, that you need argue for that against the *Socinians*; so that your meaning is plain. You do well to have two Schemes in readiness, one a Trinity of *Facultys*, which serves to explain the *Unity*; the other of three *Minds* (each with those three *Facultys*) which makes out a sufficient Trinity. This latter you and others make use of when you explain the *Incarnation*, because 'tis hard shewing the *Son's Nature or Mind* to be incarnate, and not the Father's, if it be the same particular individual Mind that is both *Father and Son*; the former is us'd in explaining the Trinity in General, and in *Thesi*. Now if these two happen to be inconsistent taken together, you cannot help that, because to be three Minds and yet but one, is hard to reconcile.

In my Mind you needed not to insist on the Authority of the Heathenish Philosophers about the divine *Facundity*, and a *Trinity* in God; since your Adversarys have been so willing to own you to be *Paganish* enough in your Notions. And as you own there is some Corruption in the *Pagan* Notions of these Matters, so they imagine there is more than you apprehend. Vid. *Platonism unveiled*.

Let me only remark one thing

more, viz. That when you illustrate the Union of the Divine Nature to the Human in 7. Ch. by the Union of Man's Soul to his Body, p. 51. you don't account well for the Communication of the Propertys of the two Natures. You (tho contrary to the *Alexandrian* and best Copys) read that Text, *Acts* 20. 28. of *God's Blood*, and think what was done in the Man, may be said as truly of the united God; as *Man is said to eat*, &c. when it belongs only to the Body. Whereas in this last Speech the Propertys of the Body are not at all attributed to the Soul, as those of the humane are by you to the divine Nature. To say, *God shed his Blood, or was Flesh, or made Flesh*, is answerable to such Expressions, as *the Soul drinks*, the Soul is made Body, &c. And if we never speak so notwithstanding the personal Union in Man, then it may seem hard to justify such Expressions, as *God's Blood and dying*, &c. by any such personal Union of the two Natures, as never is a ground for such Communication of Propertys, in the Instance you parallel it by.

You say nothing for the *Procession* of the H. Spirit (as distinct from Generation, which is a great Article of Faith) from Scripture, only that he proceeded from the Father, *John* 15. 26. or goes forth. So all Gifts do, and Christ proceeded from the Father too, *Ch.* 8. 42. & 14. 28. and he proceeded (the very word us'd of the Spirit) from *Jericho*, *Mark* 10. 46. Is that all the ground you would shew for such a distinct Article?

To conclude, Unless you state your Notion more clearly, what Trinity you will maintain, 'tis in vain to cap Texts about you know not what. 'Tis easy to bend a Phrase divers ways. Unless you fix your Notion of a Trinity more distinctly, had you not better leave Men to believe only some Trinity in general, tho they can't well

well tell what? And tho you may think there is no such vast difference between believing and not believing, one knows not what in particular, as that Men should damn and hereticate each other for it; yet certainly 'tis better to be content with this little *implicit* Faith, than to go about explaining what you cannot. For when all's done, a Man's *Faith* is not his Words but his Sense and *Meaning*; and he who says a large *Creed* but means nothing, believes no more nor makes any more use of it, than he who denies it all, let him boast never so of his Faith.

And when you have brought a Text or two for Christ's being call'd God; and suppose it to be the Supreme God that is united to the Man Ch. J. yet if the *Unitarians* say, 'tis God the *Father*, as they gather from *John* 14. 10. who was manifest in that *Flesh*, and so the *Father* and he be one, in as near Union as you imagine of a Second Person; and that therefore he is call'd, as you say, the *Everlasting Father*, *Isai.* 9. 6. which they think gave great virtue to his Performances; what are you the nearer?

You'll do great service indeed, if you satisfy the *Unitarians* Scruples; not by corporeal resemblances of the Trinity, from 3 (or 4) Dimensions or Postures of a Body; or of the eternal Generation, by the *Light* (which you call an *Effect* of the Sun, but is indeed the very Sun it self, so may well be as old) nor by vain Boasts of the early *Fathers* (so often yielded up to the *Arians*) nor by concealing their strongest Objections. Shew 'em that they have no ground to imagine Two or Three Gods (or *Infinite Minds*) to be imply'd in your Scheme of the Trinity, as they have fancy'd, not so much from the Expressions *God of God*, and *one equal to God* (and so far not the very same) in divine Per-

fections; as from the *Nature of your Scheme* it self; as when you hold the divine Nature to be personally united to Man, but yet not the *Father*; as if, say they, he was not in that divine Nature that is incarnate, but another. Also that the Divine Nature and the Three Persons are the same [else say your own side, there will be a Quaternity, *viz.* Three Persons, and one Nature besides: see *Le Blanc Theol. de Dei simplicitate*, p. 100.] yet the three Persons are not incarnate, tho the divine Nature (which is the same thing) be: That tho there be three Persons in the divine Nature alone, yet when that Nature is join'd to another intelligent Nature, 'tis all but one Person. Indeed two or three infinite Minds would easily solve all this; but then the *Oxford Decree* 1695. has declar'd that impious and heretical. No doubt you'll do it another way: and having also made it appear, that there is no such difficulty in supposing a begotten Being to be *self-existent* and independent; or else that he should be Supreme God and the first Cause, tho he was not self-existent but dependent; and may have all the Perfections of God, tho he have not that of unbegotten Self-existence: Then I say you'll go on smoothly with your Texts; but if you silently grant 'em, that these are really Contradictions, and really chargeable on your Opinions, you'll not wonder if they conclude, all those human Comments on God's Word, which support 'em, to be erroneous. That you therefore, Sir, may not lose your Labor, nor they the Benefit of it; pray be so kind as to take this Advice, from one who truly wishes to see the *Unitarians* Errors detected, and that you may write to better purpose for the Church, than you are said to have written for the State.





# A VINDICATION of the REMARKS upon Mr. Cha. Leslie's First Dialogue on the Soci- nian Controversy.



S I R,

I Shall hasten over your Preamble, in which you represent me for a *Socinian*, as if every one, who has not so good an Opinion of the Truth of Contradictions as you have, must needs be such; and also your feigning me to be in a *Passion*, for only censuring your weak Arguments, that you might poorly infer thence, I was a *Lofer by my Talking*; while a whole Torrent of personal Reflections on the Dead, by whole mouthfuls of Reproach, viz. that *pragmatical Here:ick, ignorant Pedant Biddle, Dial. 2. pag. 60.* witnesses the Candor and Tenderness of your meek, inoffensive Spirit: All this I wave as little to the purpose, and proceed upon the Argument.

I perceive, by your Answer to the Remarks, that you are resolv'd to found your Scheme of a Trinity on *Mystery and Ignorance*, and to cover your self from the *Unitarians* by impenetrable Darkness, which you make your Defence. You seem to admit, that as far as human Reason can judg, there are irreconcilable Contradictions in your Scheme of Faith: and therefore, in order to support your Notions, you endeavor to support the Credit of plain Contradictions; intimating, That we conceive of God no otherwise than as a blind Man of Sight, i. e. with a Mind full of Contradictions. To this end

You asserted, that what is a Contradiction in one Nature, may be none in another. I affirm the contrary, that a Contradiction, consisting of two repugnant Propositions, is ever the same, apply it to what Nature you will; because the same thing cannot both

be, and not be at once, whether it be said of God or Man.

You attempted to prove your Paradox by the Motion of the Thoughts to Rome, &c. and of the Eyes to the Stars as soon as to the Chimney-Top; which, you say, implies the going two Yards as soon as one; which is a Contradiction in walking, you grant, but not in the Motion of Thoughts and Eyes. Now tho' I had shown, that there was really no such Motion in the Thoughts or Eyes, and you seem to be ashamed of it, and therefore shift off one Part on your Man without Thought, which is a contradictory Supposition (which it was time for you to quit, pag. 2. and therefore I shall not expose you on it) and another upon some poor blind Man, that your self might not bear the shame of such Folly; yet you are again trumping up your old Instances, and argue from 'em as if they were true; especially from the Motion of Sight, and the Impossibility of a Born-Blind Man's Conception of Sight, any otherwise than by allowing the aforesaid Contradiction (as 'tis in the Motion of the Legs) to take place here in the Eyes. You ask, p. 2. *How can you explain to him, how the Eye can reach a Star as soon as the Chimney? He feels his Eye with his Hand that 'tis fix'd in his Head; how then can he imagine it gets a thousand Miles off, while he feels it does not stir?* Did ever any Man trifle worse! I tell you, and you seem to admit it, that there is no such thing as the Eyes moving a thousand miles; and yet you suppose your blind Man must be falsely told, and must believe it. I don't wonder if the

A

poor





# A VINDICATION of the REMARKS upon Mr. Cha. Leslie's First Dialogue on the Socinian Controversy.



S I R,

I Shall hasten over your Preamble, in which you represent me for a *Socinian*, as if every one, who has not so good an Opinion of the Truth of Contradictions as you have, must needs be such; and also your feigning me to be in a *Passion*, for only censuring your weak Arguments, that you might poorly infer thence, I was a *Lofer by my Talking*; while a whole Torrent of personal Reflections on the Dead, by whole mouthfuls of Reproach, viz. that *pragmatical Here:ick, ignorant Pedant Biddle, Dial. 2. pag. 60.* witnesses the Candor and Tenderness of your *meek, inoffensive Spirit*: All this I wave as little to the purpose, and proceed upon the Argument.

I perceive, by your Answer to the *Remarks*, that you are resolv'd to found your Scheme of a Trinity on *Mystery and Ignorance*, and to cover your self from the *Unitarians* by impenetrable Darkness, which you make your Defence. You seem to admit, that as far as human Reason can judg, there are irreconcilable Contradictions in your Scheme of Faith: and therefore, in order to support your Notions, you endeavor to support the Credit of plain Contradictions; intimating, That we conceive of God no otherwise than as a blind Man of Sight, i. e. with a Mind full of Contradictions. To this end

You asserted, that what is a Contradiction in one Nature, may be none in another. I affirm the contrary, that a Contradiction, consisting of two repugnant Propositions, is ever the same, apply it to what Nature you will; because the same thing cannot both

be, and not be at once, whether it be said of God or Man.

You attempted to prove your Paradox by the Motion of the Thoughts to Rome, &c. and of the Eyes to the Stars as soon as to the Chimney-Top; which, you say, implies the going two Yards as soon as one; which is a Contradiction in walking, you grant, but not in the Motion of Thoughts and Eyes. Now tho I had shown, that there was really no such Motion in the Thoughts or Eyes, and you seem to be asham'd of it, and therefore shift off one Part on your Man without Thought, which is a contradictory Supposition (which it was time for you to quit, pag. 2. and therefore I shall not expose you on it) and another upon some poor blind Man, that your self might not bear the shame of such Folly; yet you are again trumping up your old Instances, and argue from 'em as if they were true; especially from the Motion of Sight, and the Impossibility of a Born-Blind Man's Conception of Sight, any otherwise than by allowing the aforesaid Contradiction (as 'tis in the Motion of the Legs) to take place here in the Eyes. You ask, p. 2. *How can you explain to him, how the Eye can reach a Star as soon as the Chimney? He feels his Eye with his Hand that 'tis fix'd in his Head; how then can he imagine it gets a thousand Miles off, while he feels it does not stir?* Did ever any Man trifle worse! I tell you, and you seem to admit it, that there is no such thing as the Eyes moving a thousand miles; and yet you suppose your blind Man must be falsely told, and must believe it. I don't wonder if the

A

poor



poor abus'd Man conceive that to be a flat *Contradiction*, which in Truth is so even to a seeing Man, and which he ought not to believe. But does this prove that 'tis no *Contradiction* to move a *thousand Yards* as soon as one, because you fallily told him, and he foolishly believ'd you, that your Eyes did move so, when they never could do it, because 'tis a *Contradiction*? I thought you were to prove a real *Contradiction* in one Case to be none in another; and now you suppose a *Contradiction* which is not, and conclude from it as if it truly were. So that

This is in effect your Argument; Supposing the Eyes did move to the Stars as soon as to the Chimny, or your Thoughts to Rome in an instant (as they do not) then here would be an Instance of that being a *Contradiction* in one Case, viz. in *Legs*, which is none in another, viz. *Eyes*: but tho there be no such thing in the Premises, yet the Conclusion is true, because it would have been true, if the Premises had been so. No doubt, Sir, you argue very desperately! How does this prove, a *Contradiction* in one Case may be none in another?

But, say you, 'Tis impossible to explain to him what Sight is, so as to reconcile it from being a *Contradiction* to him. I answer, that a true and just Explication of it will not contain any real *Contradiction* in it: and if to him it appears a *Contradiction*, 'tis from his Mistake alone; and you are not to shew that a seeming *Contradiction* may be none (for who doubts that?) but that a real *Contradiction* may, in some Cases, be none. And I pray what *Contradiction* will appear to him, according to what was said, *That the Eye moves not up, but the Star strikes on the Eye*? To this you say, *The blind Man does not feel this, p. 2. nor knows what you mean by it, or by Seeing*. But is this any *Contradiction* to him, that he shou'd not feel every subtle Particle that touches on him? or that he shou'd have no Idea of Sight? You add, *He can't think of any other way, but that the Eye must get up to the Star, or the Star come down to the Eye*. I expected he could only imagine his Eye went up to the Star, as you had suggested before, to represent the *Contradiction* of moving so far in an instant; and now you allow him another Conception of Sight, viz. *That the Star may extend*

to his Eye. But this is quite another Matter from your Instance of the Eyes going up so many thousand Miles, and has no such Appearance of a *Contradiction*. Nor will it serve your Turn for an Example of a *Contradiction's becoming no Contradiction*: So that, it seems, he may be convinc'd another way, than by persuading him, that what is a *Contradiction* in one Nature is none in another, which you say is the only way, and I that 'tis no way at all; and if he be to be convinc'd this way, he must be suppos'd to have a worse blemish than want of Eye-sight.

The most you can reasonably pretend to here, is, That I can't by my Words help him to form a just Idea of Sight (which is thro his want of necessary Organs) but it does not thence follow, that he ought to take up with a Conception that implies plain *Contradictions*, which he knows must be wrong, and ought to be rejected: For tho he may not conceive what Sight is (nor is it made his Duty, as in the other Case, to which you parallel it) yet he may be sure 'tis not made up of *Contradictions*. A Man may not understand a thing, and yet understand very well that *Contradictions* about it are false; and this is all the Stress I laid upon this Instance. So that this is no Argument against objecting *Contradictions* to some Mens Notions of the Divine Nature; since in no Case whatever are the blindest Creatures oblig'd to believe direct *Contradictions*, nor would they become no *Contradictions*, if they shou'd believe 'em erroneously.

To what purpose then was that faint Triumph, p. 3. *I will join Issue with him upon it, if he can find Words proper to express the Nature of Sight to a Man born blind, and will give him leave to infer Contradictions from such Words, according as he understands 'em; then I will undertake to solve all the Contradictions in the Terms, by which we express the Holy Trinity*. To explain it so as to enable him to form a clear Idea of it in his Imagination, I neither undertook, nor is it his Duty to have such an Idea, much less to take up with any that are false. But still I say, that a true Explication of the Operation of Sight will never lead him to infer *Contradictions*. If he imagine any in it, which is a certain *Contradiction* (in other Cases) he

as certainly does not rightly take in the true Explication of *this*, and ought to conclude he is in an Error, and to set himself against it; and must either bring his Thoughts to a Consistency, or explicitly believe nothing in the Matter: for no Man, pretend what he will, does believe apparent Contradictions to be none, or (which is the same) to be possibly true; he must, at least, suspend his Assent.

And yet, I believe, as to matter of Fact, that many such blind Persons, tho they have no distinct Idea of Sight, are very far from entertaining Contradictions about it; at least they would be so, if they had understanding Instructors that did not err, as is suppos'd in your Case; where God is reputed the Teacher of *your* Notions of the H. Trinity, who will hardly be thought to leave any Doctrine upon us, to be believ'd under the unavoidable Notion of a Contradiction.

Therefore if there were no Difference between the two Cases you think to be so like, viz. of a blind Man's conceiving such a thing as *Sight*, and your Conception of the Trinity; yet there is no reason from thence for taking up with Contradictions in the latter, since 'tis not requisite nor fit to do so in the former.

Besides, who can easily believe such a Case to be really true in the Christian Dispensation, viz. That the All-wise and Good God shou'd impose upon a Generation of Men, *born blind*, a long Creed, of the nature of *Light*, and *Refractions*, and Colors, or a *System of Opticks*; of which they cou'd have no manner of Conception, nor make any Use, only it might set 'em together by the Ears in ignorant Contention? Or that ever he wou'd be pleas'd with such of themselves, as shou'd presume to be paraphrasing on *Light and Colors*, &c. in their own *novel devis'd Terms*, which they think more proper and clear, and say, are equivalent to *his* (but being wholly ignorant of the Subject, cannot know what Terms are more or less proper) nay to anathematize and persecute all that assent not thereto? Verily, you insinuate no Honor to your Cause by such an untoward Representation! You own your self blind, and yet you force your Neighbors to take you for their Guide: Therefore, I conclude, Man is not so un-

capable of God's Revelations, as a blind Man of knowing and using the Sun's Light; and I'll suppose you pretend greater Incapacity in Men, and less Benefit from Revelation thereupon, than is true or fit, merely to cover your own Errors, and feign your self blind, that you may be excus'd in holding Contradictions. Tho Blindness it self, as I have shewn, does not constrain us to take that for no Contradiction in one Nature, which is evidently and truly so in another, as you pretend.

After this Absurdity of yours had been expos'd as ridiculous, you wou'd fain hook me into your Company to take share, calling Spectators, p. 4. to see me confessing what I had ridicul'd. But why so? Did I say a Contradiction may sometimes be no Contradiction? No. I had granted, say you, there may be something attributed to one Nature, where there is nothing inconsistent or contradictory to it; while, if attributed to another, it might meet with something inconsistent; whence a Contradiction will arise in the one, and not in the other: And so I say still; only I added what you omit, that one of the two Terms of a Contradiction is not the Contradiction, but both together are, and are so in any Nature. And now let as many as you will see, if I say what you had said. Is this all one, to say that a Contradiction (which is two inconsistent Propositions) is sometimes no Contradiction, which is what You said; and that one of the Propositions alone is no Contradiction, which is what I said? Do I, that say Dependence and Derivation of Being is no Contradiction, when said of a Creature, where is nothing repugnant, say the same as he, that says such Dependence and Derivation may be no Contradiction, when said of the Independent, Self-existent God, and First Cause, where the other repugnant Term is found? As mutual Blows make the Fight, so two repugnant Terms make the Contradiction; and this I say still, on sure Grounds, is always absurd, say it of what Nature you will.

Well, but if I did not say what you said (because you are resolv'd we shall agree) you say you meant the same as I say: That *this* is all you contend for, and you desire no more. But this is not all you contended for, you said more, in saying, a Contradiction in one Nature may be none in another: nay,



you meant more, if Words can shew your meaning, by your Instance of going two Yards as soon as one; i. e. to go but one Yard, and yet more than one at once. This is your Resemblance, how a Contradiction in one Case may be none in another; that is, two contradictory Propositions may become not contradictory, as if the Verity of Propositions cou'd be chang'd. Nay, I must add, that this is not all you desire, for your Argument needs more to defend it against the Unitarians.

You know they don't deny that some things may be Contradictions, if affirm'd of Men, which are none when said of God; as to be Eternal, or Infinite, is not, with them, a Contradiction when said of God, because 'twere so if said of Man. You were not so weak to argue for what they always asserted; contrariwise, you did suppose the Socinian to charge you with holding two opposite repugnant Propositions, viz. That God is Unoriginate, and yet a deriv'd Nature, is the first Cause, and yet has a Father and a Cause (as the Greek Fathers express it of the Son) that he is but one He, and yet three He's, &c. Now that such sort of Contradictions, if real, can ever be true, you affirm'd, but I never said; and therefore pray don't call me any more to be your Voucher in such a Case; for you certainly intended more than I said or you pretend: and 'tis incumbent on you, either to shew that these are no Contradictions which they object for such, or that they are not chargeable on your Faith; or if they be real Contradictions, that cleave fast to you, yet there is no Absurdity in them, because Contradictions (i. e. two opposite Propositions) may sometimes be none, or not opposite; and that to be, and not be, may sometimes be the same. And then you'd do more towards the reconciling the Gallican and English Churches, than if their two Synods had sat at the same time, or than is done by the Author of the Regale, &c. Transubstantiation will then be a credible Mystery!

And now since I said nothing that has any Likeness to what I expos'd in yours, you need not pretend to wonder, How I can deny, that what is a Contradiction in one Nature, may yet be none in another. I shou'd wonder more, if I did not deny such an Absurdity.

Your other assistance, which you complain

was not taken notice of, viz. That 'tis no Contradiction for all things to be present with God, tho' it be a Contradiction to Men that the past or future things shou'd be present, is to the same purpose as the rest: for in one sense 'tis no Contradiction to either, i. e. for a past thing to be objectively present in the Idea, and so it may be with Man; and in another sense 'tis a Contradiction in both, i. e. to behold that as actually doing now which is past; for so God himself does not behold the original Chaos, as now actually existing void of Form, nor does he judg Adam and Eve to be now in their first Innocency. I doubt some are fond of making abundance of needless Contradictions, on purpose to keep some darling Absurdity of their own in countenance. But tho' I am not so vain as to pretend to reconcile all Difficultys, or to say which side is wrong, much less to fathom the boundless Perfections of my glorious Creator; yet I think it is no Arrogance to say, that I am sure both sides of a Problem, or real Contradiction, cannot be true, about any Object: or if they may be both true, and a Contradiction in one Case be none in another, why will you not have a little Charity, and allow that the Unitarians and you don't contradict each other? But tho' in some Cases, 'twou'd be a Contradiction to affirm and deny the same thing; yet of the Divine Nature to do thus, may possibly be none; and so we are good Friends.

Your next Refuge is, That the Nature of God being incomprehensible, we must not object Contradictions in it, from comparing it with our own, because we understand not his Nature, p. 4. To this I said, it might have some fair Pretence, if we had no Knowledge at all about it; but that we have so much Knowledge, tho' partial, as warrants us to deny what is contradictory to it: hence we justly deny many things for being incompatible to the Divine Attributes, to his Spirituality, Goodness, &c. And why may we not as well discern what is contradictory to the Divine Unity, which is as manifest as the others? You reply, That the Attributes and Nature are different; and this is a Dispute not about God's Attributes, but his Nature, of which we are totally ignorant; that 'tis utter Darkness to us, &c.

I might answer you, That *Essential* Attributes, or Perfections, are the *very Essence* under so many various inadequate Conceptions; that God is not compounded of Essence and Perfections, as of different things, but that his very Nature is Goodness, Power, Wisdom, &c. But I will not obscure my Argument, by entring on *metaphysical* Nicetys. I have enough to say without this: for supposing what you crave, there may be good ground to object Contradictions in this Case; for, 1. The Divine *Unity* is one of his Attributes by consent of all, and so may be argu'd about, and Contradictions may be discern'd and objected here as well as in other Attributes. And, 2. Were it otherwise, yet may Contradictions safely be discern'd and started about the Divine Nature, on these Accounts.

1. 'Tis sufficient for this, if I but know what God *is not* in any respect: All allow one way of knowing God is *per viam Negationis*, by denying of his Nature every thing that argues Imperfection. Now if I do but know what God certainly *is not*, I may then object against any thing that, in contradiction thereto, does affirm him to be what I know he is not. Thus if I know that *Derivation of Being* from any other Cause, is what cannot belong to the first supreme Nature, I may justly object Contradiction to those who shall affirm this unoriginate Nature to have a Cause. If I know his Nature can be but one, I object soberly against them that shall say, there are many supreme Divine Natures. I will object against all Imperfection, as a Contradiction to that ever glorious *Jehovah*: and I must know, in some Instances, what is Imperfection, else I shall not know but God may be *mutable* and *mortal* in his Nature, if I cannot know that these are Imperfections.

2. If I know but any Property or Perfection of his Nature, I may know *that* to be a Contradiction to his Nature, which denies that Perfection or Property. If I know he is a *necessary eternal Being*, I know well that he is of a Nature that *cannot die*. If I know from Reason or Scripture that he is *all-knowing*, I know 'tis a Contradiction to say of him, who *is that Nature*, that he is ignorant of any one thing. Nay,

3. If I knew neither what he *is not*, nor what any Perfection of his Nature *is*; yet

if I knew but what is a Contradiction in the Nature of the thing, and to it self, I may safely say, 'tis a Contradiction when apply'd to God, because 'tis so in it self. Thus *to be* and *not be* at once, to be but *one single Person*, and yet 3 such Persons, being repugnant, may safely be objected for a Contradiction, without any regard to the Nature 'tis apply'd to, because of the mutual repugnancy of the two Propositions, which always destroy one another, and cannot be said of the same thing. So that I don't, in this Case, object a Contradiction in God, from a Supposition that his Nature is resembled by mine, but from the bare Nature of a Contradiction. I may doubt whether God be a pure Spirit, or be only a gross Body; whether my Soul be material or immaterial: but leaving this still in doubt, I am sure 'tis not both *material* and *immaterial*. And if any one shall say, There are both *many Gods*, and *but one such God* in Nature; that once he was not in being, but yet eternally was and is to come; I hope, in these Cases (like to which Contradictions the *Socinians* pretend) one needs not stay till he knows perfectly what the Nature of God is, before he pronounces 'em to be Contradictions. And therefore 'twas not rightly said of you, *Dial. 1. p. 7. That no Contradiction can be charg'd in any Nature we don't understand*, especially when your self had granted to the *Socinian*, *That it is a Contradiction to say, Three Persons (in God) are but one Person*; which, I represented to you, was what the *Socinians* charg'd your Scheme with: and therefore you were bound (but wou'd not attempt it) to shew, that this Contradiction is not chargeable upon you; instead of which you cry, a Contradiction in Man may be no Contradiction in God, when 'twas granted 'em, that this were a Contradiction even in God.

Having made it appear, that our Ignorance of the incomprehensible God, does not render us wholly incapable of discovering certain Contradictions in Mens Notions of him, I may conclude you have not taken an effectual Course to convince the *Unitarians*, by saying they must not argue from Contradictions: So that the Matter rests as at the end of the *Remarks*, viz. That it will be expected you shall shew that those and the like Difficultys, objected by them,



them, are either not Contradictions, or not truly charg'd on *your* Faith of a Trinity in God. If you go on to appear so willing to allow 'em those two Points, I dare say you'll gain no Ground.

Besides, let me add these Remarks :

1. That you have laid a fair Foundation for *Scepticism*: for nothing can be said of God, tho most absurd, which on your Principles can be confuted; because not knowing his Nature, we must not say any thing is a Contradiction to it. Nay, since you say we know not the *Nature of man* (perhaps he may be three Persons and one Man) nor of *Trees*, or a *Pile of Grass*, we cannot then urge Contradictions about them, and so cannot argue about the Nature of any thing; since all Arguments tend to shew a Contradiction in what we argue against, and so we can prove and be certain of nothing.

Nay, we cannot confute *Transubstantiation*, for we know not the *Nature of Bread and Flesh* (for Sense cannot reach that) and so may not object Contradictions in the Case.

Nay, you can't confute a *Socinian* this way; for you can't tell whether a Denial of a Trinity be not consistent with a Trinity, according to you, because this is about the *Nature of God*: and not understanding that, we must not object Contradictions here. How know you that God is not *three Essences* and *one Person*? The Scripture says not expressly either this or the contrary.

2. You can never justify any long *Creeeds* or *Explications* of the Trinity, &c. in other Words than Scriptural: for how shall Men believe your Pretences of Humility, that you can't comprehend God, when at the same time you are for explaining his Nature in unintelligible Terms, *novel*, and more obscure than the Scripture? If you don't know the Divine Nature, then be silent about it. How dare you say this or that is equivalent to the Scripture-Terms, or *more proper*, when that is to be judg'd of by the Nature of the (unknown) Subject? But you are for explaining the Text, and urging that it must have *this and that* sense; sometimes it must be *figurative*, and sometimes literal; and are for scriving Reason as long as you can hold it, and then run to *Mystery*, when Reason and scholastick Wit are spent; and tell your Adversary, he must

not argue about the incomprehensible God; as if you meant, that you may reason, but only 'tis not fit for a *Socinian's* Reason to meddle; it must be, because their Reason is of a lesser Size.

Nay, is it any great Sign of *Humility of Reason*, to be so confident of your *Deductions*, as to oppress or anathematize such as testify their Dissent from them, tho they assent to the Text whence you pretend to infer 'em? And how know you whether their Sense and Inferences or yours be truest, since the Terms you say are all but *Allusions*, and that about a Nature you know nothing of? Of all Men such may seem the proudest Exalters of human Reason in matters of Faith, even while they decry and reproach it in their more peaceable Adversarys.

3. You could not confute the Pagan Notions of the Divine Nature your way: supposing they held many Gods, or that there is but one Divine Nature, and all the thousands of particular Gods but a *multitude of Persons* in that one Nature (as you suppose many Men in but one human Nature) you could not confute 'em by the Light of Reason at least, because you allow not Contradictions to be an Argument here.

For the Honor of Christianity, I beseech you, never insist on it, that to be a *Christian* is to believe, that a *Contradiction* may sometimes be none at all, and that this is the only way to persuade a Man to be such. I thank God I am convinc'd without it.

I shall do you no Injury if I pass by your wonderful Proofs for the Memory's being another Faculty from that by which we understand, p. 5. viz. That the Understanding is only conversant about what is *present before it*: as if we could not understand any thing that is past, and knew not formerly; or as if the Idea of what is past may not become present to the Understanding, which yet in the next Line you own. You ask, *If the Understanding forgets?* I answer, As much as the Memory. But I have shew'd, that three Facultys in one Mind is no parallel for your Trinity. 'Tis neither a *Mystery*, nor will it resemble (what the *Unitarians* object to you) how three Persons can be but one Person; unless instead of three Facultys making but one Soul, you had shown that three Facultys make but one Faculty,

or

or three *Minds*, but one *Mind*. Nay, you are so tenacious, that whether there be really three Facultys in the Soul or not, you say it does as well for you if it be *but thought so*. Right or wrong, 'tis all one to you. You will hold to the Conclusion, let what will become of the Premises. This is true Courage!

You find fault, that I will argue *strictly* from the word *Person*, as 'tis us'd among Men; when I only shew it does not answer the Parallel in that Point (of three being but one in the same Sense) for which you bring it. And since you use the word *Persons* for explaining better the Scripture-Language, you must suppose it to be more proper and less ambiguous; and till you give another Sense, I must understand it after the known use of it. You add, pag. 6. If he wou'd apply the word *Father* so, and the words *Repent and Grieve*, that are said of God, what Work wou'd he make? &c. As to the first Term, I see nothing absurd in it. For the other Terms of *Repent*, &c. the nature of the Subject bids me give 'em a figurative Sense, and I shou'd not dare to use 'em of God, if the Scripture had not done it, which is not your Case; much less wou'd I put 'em into my *explicatory Creeds*. But if at the same time the *Athanasians* wou'd publicly declare, they no more believe three Persons to be in God, than that God can repent or grieve properly; and wou'd give us another fair and open Sense of the Terms, as of the other, that may comport with the Scripture-Account of God, of his Son J. C. and his H. Spirit, and with the rest of their Scheme, then you might have some Pretence for talking thus. But if you assign to the *Sacred Three* all the various Parts and Distinctions of Persons in a proper Sense, and for that reason do give 'em these Characters: How can considering Men think, you don't design by it, to give 'em an Idea of three proper Persons in one eternal He? And you your self deny the Expressions are figurative, p. 25. Dial. 1. speaking of such Texts as are alledg'd for a *Trinity of Persons*.

You are mistaken, in saying, I raise Difficultys how a begotten Being can be God, from gross Conceptions of begetting after the manner of Men, pag. 6. I never had a Thought of more than of a Being deriv'd from another, which I think is the allow'd Sense of *Begotten*, as

apply'd to the Lord Jesus, who receives his Nature dependently on the Father, says Dr. Whitby on John 14. 28. speaking also the Sense of the antient Fathers: So that the Difficulty is no other, than how a deriv'd dependent Being can be God? which the Unitarians insist on much.

You having illustrated the Coeternity of the Son with the Father by this, that the Light is as old as the Sun, tho the Effect of it; I reply'd, That the Light is really the Sun it self. Upon which you set up a hideous Cry, as if I were bringing the whole Sun upon your Head, and fetching it out of the Firmament; even all that huge Sun, that is so many times bigger than the whole Earth: For, say you, By which we see the very Sun, so many times bigger than the whole Earth, can creep thro a Cranny, and be all of it in this Room, and in a thousand other Places at once: This will help Transubstantiation. Again, If the Light be the Star, then the very Star strikes on the Eye; and then you crow merrily. Let him consider on whose side the poor Philosophy and shallow Reasoning lies. It seems, you imagine, the Sun is not made of Parts; and that if the Sun shines into a Room, it must quit the Firmament, and must come down, all or none, I can't breathe in the Air, I warrant you, without being so unmerciful as to sup it all up; nor lay, I stand on the Earth, unless I cover it all over, from East to West. You cannot believe any subtile Streams, or Effluvia of Light, that are a part of that huge luminous Mass, which penetrate small Pores of Bodys. I did not say every Stream of Light was the whole Sun, or that the Parts that are above are beneath. But I fancy you hop'd to find an Instance from me, how a Contradiction in one Case may be none in another: the whole huge Sun in a little Cranny! Ah this subtile Socinian! as you call me. Thus you deride me to your Cost, as Lactantius did the Antipodes, for going with their Heels upmost.

I heartily wish, Sir, you wou'd entertain the Coffee-Houses for one Year with a Course of your Philosophy, I dare promise you many Admirers; and when that has prevail'd, no doubt but your Divinity will go off.

All the Answer you give to the Objection against three Persons in God, from his being spoken of singularly, as I, Thou, He; is, That



That in the first of *Genesis*, &c. God is spoken of plurally; for instead of *God created*, you say, *Dial. 2.* 'tis *Gods* he created: That three Persons are mention'd, the *Father*, *Word* (because God spake, and Speech contains Words) and *Spirit*, and *these Gods made*, &c. So that if Plurality be express'd, as you say well, 'tis a *Plurality of Gods*; if the Singular be *God*, the Plural is certainly *Gods*. Pray stick to that. 'Tis an obvious Reply to this, that 'tis an usual *Hebraism* to put the *Plural* for the *Singular*, and so Princes and others say *We*, when 'tis but *one*. You say indeed, that, in the Royal Language, *We* notes the King and *his Council*; as if *Our Royal Pleasure*, and *We command*, did relate to any but himself. *Dial. 5.* But to silence you once for all in this matter: Know that this Plural Term *Gods*, *Elohim*, is said of one of the Persons alone; *Psal. 45. 7.* *Thy Throne, O Gods, is for ever and ever*: And, *O Gods, thy Gods have anointed thee*, which the Apostle applies to Christ, *Heb. 1. 9.* Now unless the Son have another Trinity in him, the *Plural Word* can't intend three Persons, but one, only it is more majestic.

But what must we say to this, that in the New Testament (the proper Place for this Article) there is not so much as one such Expression, but always *He* in the Singular? It had been meet to shew where many Persons ever use the diminutive Language I

and *Me*; which you aim at, in telling us, That 'tis said of a King, *He march'd*, &c. when it means *all his Army*: but tho it supposes all the Army, it does express the King alone, and his Authority, and therefore is Singular; for if three Princes together have the Command, it wou'd no longer be, *He march'd*, but *They*, which shews you are out: So that the Objection (with the greatest part of the Remarks) lies on your Hands still.

As for your Comments on other Texts, they are Arrows shot at no Mark, till you state your Notion, whether *three infinite Minds*, or but *one*. Your Expositions are precarious, or go no higher than *Arianism*, or are obviated oft in the *Socinian Comments*; and in answering *their Texts* you are as modest (on *John 17. 3.* *1 Cor. 8. 5.*) as if you said nothing. Pray, Sir, tell us whereabouts your Answer is to the Text, of *that Day knows my Father only*, which some cannot find among your answer'd Texts; and yet it was in that *little Book*, which is all that you venture to attack, and no Text is more urg'd by the *Unitarians*. Pardon this Freedom, Sir, in pursuance of your *Desire to hear from me again*; who, I assure you, am act'd herein by no Passion, except it be a passionate Desire of seeing our H. Christian Religion rescu'd from the Burden of Contradictions.



F I N I S.

A N  
EXAMINATION

O F

Mr. *Leslie's* Last Dialogue,

Relating to the

*Satisfaction of Jesus Christ.*

Together with some

R E M A R K S

O N

Dr. STILLINGFLEET'S *True Reasons*  
*of Christ's Sufferings.*



L O N D O N;

Printed in the Year M.DCC.VIII.



A M  
EXAMINATION

OF

Mr. Jesse's Dialogues

Relating to the

Conversion of Jews

Together with some

R E M A R K S

By the Rev. Mr. Jesse



Printed in the Year MDCCLIII

thence  
the res  
in the  
the lik  
ings,  
which  
ly the  
of Sin  
to be n  
ment o  
which  
telling  
faction  
that if  
satisfy,  
what w  
As to  
I doubt  
Cause  
or mor  
ever sa  
into yo  
what y  
you w  
pinchi  
tarians  
strict  
free g  
disinge  
yet syn  
you H  
Trade  
little o  
call thi  
it app  
the Co  
stand  
your  
and th  
your

S I R,

**I** Make bold to present you with my Thoughts on your last Dialogue, relating to the *Satisfaction of our Lord J. Ch.* in opposition to the *Unitarians*; and shall examine what pretence you have from thence to infer his Supreme Deity: For as to the rest, the *Unitarians* are no more concern'd in the Dispute than the *Arminians*, who give the like Account with them of Christ's Sufferings. They can bear with any Notions here, which don't subvert the Justice of God, or sully the Glory of his Free Grace in the Pardon of Sin: But they stily deny any just Inference to be made from the true account of the Atonement of Sin by J. C. for his Supreme Deity, which is what you and others drive at: you telling us, pag. 1. that *the Doctrine of the Satisfaction is built upon the Trinity, and Divinity of Christ*; that *if he were not God as well as Man, he could not satisfy*, &c. This is the common Plea, but of what weight 'tis will be seen by what follows.

As to your Management of the Argument, I doubt whether any that was hearty in the Cause ever prosecuted it, either more feebly or more unfairly; for what no *Socinian* would ever say, nay what he expressly denies, you put into your *Socinian's* Mouth, and make him speak what you found in *Trinitarian* Books, because you judg'd it might be odious. The most pinching and obvious Argument which the *Unitarians* insist on, viz. the Inconsistency of a strict equivalent meritorious Satisfaction, with free *gratuitous* Pardon, you are so ignorant, or disinclined, as never once to mention; and yet have the Vanity to tell the World, you have consider'd the chief of the *Socinian* *Tracts*, when you have only attack'd one very little one, which for your own Glory you must call *that most celebrated Book with them*. To me it appears, that you have but just dip'd into the Controversy, and don't so much as understand the true State of it. In order to shew your Defects, I shall first state the Matter in Dispute;

and then shew how short you are of proving your Point against the *Unitarians*.

As to the Matter in Dispute; I will not

lay weight upon Words and Phrases, that may have various and uncertain Meanings. The Term *Satisfaction*, in a legal sense, is wholly unscriptural. I think you are not quite so happy as ridiculous, in pretending to discover it in *Isa. 53. 11.* which I think none before did; and I fancy none after you will interpret of a Satisfaction to Justice, when it plainly speaks of a complacential Delight the *Servant of God* should have in the Issue of his Undertaking. But any jingle of Words serves some Men, let the Sense be ever so foreign to their purpose; however, neither the unscriptural Term *Satisfaction*, nor the scriptural Terms *Redemption*, *Propitiation*, *Atonement*, *Sacrifice*, &c. is the Matter of this Dispute: the *Unitarians* can allow all these, and the very *Racovian Catechism*, which you say is their Standard, expressly allows J. C. to be our expiatory *Sacrifice*, chap. 8. and that in the same sense as, nay, in a fuller than *Sacrifices under the Law* were such. So that they have said what is false, who tell the World, that the *Socinians* in general deny Christ dy'd a proper Sacrifice for Sin: much less do the *Arian Unitarians* decline the Expression. Nor shall the Phrase of *nostro loco*, or his dying in our stead, make any Difference; so that the *Antinomian* sense of his sustaining our legal Person, be excluded. The *Racovian Catechism* asserts it, that Christ dy'd as *Victimæ succedanea*. And I think he that suffers with a Design to prevent our Suffering (which is granted) truly suffers in our stead.

But the true State of the Question is about the meaning of the aforesaid Expressions, viz. *Whether or not our Lord J. Ch. endur'd such infinite Punishment at the hands of God, as was a full equivalent Compensation to vindictive Justice for the Sins of Men, and strictly meritorious of their Pardon*. It must not only be Punishment, but equivalent to all that a World of Sinners had deserv'd at the hands of severe Justice for ever: and in order to this it must be *Infinite in value*; for no other Notion of Christ's Satisfaction can afford you so much as a pretence of an Argument for his *Infinite Deity*. Therefore you call it *Infinite Satisfaction*, pag. 2. as do Dr. Ed-



wards and others. If it was proper Punishment laid on Christ, yet if that was not a full Equivalent in strict Justice; nay, if 'twas an Equivalent, yet if that Equivalent did not amount to Infinite, then not being Infinite Satisfaction, it needed no Infinite Person to make it; and so your Argument for Christ's Deity will fail here.

The Unitarians Sense I take to be this, That the Lord Jesus, not so much by any physical Virtue of his Blood, or by the natural Pain and Torments of his Sufferings, but by his Obedience to the Death of the Cross, by his great Patience, Humility, Submission towards God, and transcendent Charity to Men, express'd chiefly in his Sufferings (which were the great Trial of those Vertues) did make so acceptable and rewardable an Oblation to God, that in consideration hereof he is exalted to be a Princely Advocate with a merciful God for Sinners; and in the acceptable Virtue of this Obedience to Death, his Intercession is prevalent with the Divine Mercy for Pardon, which he is authoris'd to grant. The ground of Pardon being granted in his Name, is his Obedience, which is better than a bare external Sacrifice: 'Tis not merely a Condition, as Dr. Stillingfleet pretends, p. 308. Of his Reasons of Christ's Sufferings, but a rewardable Consideration in the Case of Pardon; as a perfectly holy Life wou'd be a meet Consideration for God's gracious Recompence of eternal Happiness. The way of its Application is by his Intercession, not challeng'd of rigorous Justice as a thing strictly merited, and which God, having had the full worth of, is bound in Justice to grant as a Debt he owes to the Purchaser; but sought of the Divine Favor and Mercy, with which Christ's Obedience has given him so great a Prevalency. And herein they see the Wisdom of God highly manifested, in putting this Honor on J. C. for his consummate Vertue, that Pardon and Salvation shall, thro his Mediation, be given to them, who by him (by his Law and Example) are brought to turn from their Sins unto God; and also in making it serve as an humbling Memorial of our own Unworthiness and Distance, in being admitted to Favor by the interposal of one of the highest Vertue and Worth, and this try'd to the utmost by the most difficult Exercises. And in order to such Atonement and Pardon by J. C. they see no need of his being Supreme God.

2. Having thus stated the Case, I am next to shew how short you are of proving your Point against the Unitarians, viz. of an equivalent infinite Satisfaction to God's vindictive Justice, in order to Pardon. The Method of your (and others) Argument takes in these four things: (1.) That Divine Justice necessarily requires such Satisfaction in order to pardon Sin. (2.) That Christ has made it, by suffering such equivalent Punishment. (3.) That this Equivalent can be no less than infinite Punishment and Satisfaction. (4.) That hence it follows he must be an infinite God. Let's examine them singly.

(1.) You assert that the Justice of God obliges him to exact the utmost Farthing; i. e. to punish to the utmost what every Sin strictly deserves, and that God cannot pardon Sin till he has executed his Vengeance somewhere or other to the full. And on this 'tis that your Party build the necessity of infinite Satisfaction in order to Pardon. You ask, pag. 9. Does Justice require full Satisfaction? and are so disingenuous as to make your Socinian answer, Yes; when no Socinian will ever say it in the sense your Question intends, but on the contrary they wou'd always say, No. You say, Justice can no more remit the least Farthing, than it can cease to be, p. 47. That Justice not being satisfy'd, Justice is not done, and that is Injustice, pag. 31. This you assert, but don't prove. But so far is this from belonging to the nature of Divine Justice, that I dare say no just and good Man ever acts thus, always to demand inexorably the utmost of his strict Right. This Summum Jus is ever blam'd, as is he who is righteous only in such.

'Tis granted by the Unitarians, that punishing Justice belongs to the great Governor of the World, and that 'tis requisite it shou'd be exerted, tho not always answerably to the strict Demerit of Sin, yet answerably to the Ends of Government; and so 'tis in all regular human Governments. Accordingly God does exert this punishing Justice in many temporal Punishments, and more fully in the final Condemnation of the Incorrigible, in the day of the Revelation of the righteous Judgment of God.

But Justice does not demand the same Punishment of the Penitent, who do honor to it by their Repentance, and their humble earnest Deprecation of deserv'd Wrath: But, by your Principle, God is bound to punish the Sins

of the most ha- must no can hav other. but is when in in this Suffering gainst y absurd.

You being sa that no your co tice. ses: ei may be be done what o the for is no w to puni hated quod fie may be which Justice in givin ing oth my own another to an has a R deny h Right o jur'd P but the free i require rious, in any then he passer Justice who are not giv a P may sa tho Ju say, t shall no punish own as



of the most Penitent, as much as those of the most haughty obstinate Transgressors. He must not remit a Farthing in one Case, and he can have no more than every Farthing in the other. In short, I say, God always hates Sin, but is not bound always to punish it, only when in his Wisdom he sees it requisite. And in this Dr. *Stillingsfleet* consents, *Preface to the Sufferings of Christ*, p. 28. where he argues against your Notion of Divine Justice as very absurd.

Your only Argument, viz. That *Justice not being satisfy'd, supposes Justice not to be done*, and that not to do *Justice is Injustice*, arises from your confounding two different Notions of Justice. For a thing is said to be just in two Senses: either 'tis *quod fieri potest*, what lawfully may be done; or *quod fieri debet*, what ought to be done. Now not to do the last, that is, what ought to be done, is Injustice; but to omit the former, viz. what I may without Injustice do, is no wrong. And of this kind is God's Right to punish the penitent upright Servant for his hated Defects and forsaken Faults: this is not *quod fieri debet*. But you suppose that whatever may be done justly, ought in Justice to be done, which is very monstrous. For I pray what is Justice? Is it not to give every one his Due? 'Tis in giving, not taking, what is strictly due, giving others their Right, not exacting from 'em my own; of my own I am Master, but not of another's. And tho we say Punishment is due to an Offender, the meaning is not that he has a Right to it, which in Justice we must not deny him, but that the injur'd Person has a Right over him to take it if he pleases: the injur'd Person does not come under these Bonds, but the Offender only; so that the Injur'd is free in point of Justice, if something else don't require him to use his Power over the Injurious. If a Man can't part with his just Right in any Case, without coming short of Justice; then he is unjust in not prosecuting every Trespasser to the utmost lawful Rigor: for here Justice is not exerted. Whereas even Princes, who are trusted by the Community, and shou'd not give up their Rights, are yet endow'd with a Privilege to remit Punishment, where it may safely be; and this without any Injustice, tho Justice be not done. And dares any Man say, that the absolute Sovereign Lord of all shall not sometimes forbear to use his Right to punish his Creatures? May he not do with his own as he lists? Mat. 20. 13.

But if God must do all that with Justice he can do, then I doubt he must needs refuse Christ's Substitution; because in Justice he might either not have contriv'd, or not accepted it: and not to do Justice is, say you, Injustice. And it seems strange, that in order to magnify God's pardoning Mercy, you shou'd lay your Foundation in such a Notion of him, as represents him incapable of shewing any Mercy, and under a necessity to do all the hurt he can within the Limits of rigorous Justice. Nay, if God cannot part with the exercise of his just Right in any Point (for with his Right it self in general I grant it) then it will follow that he must pardon penitent Sinners absolutely, because it is his just Right to suspend and remit Punishment when he pleases, as much as 'tis his Right to inflict it when he sees that to be best. And if he must do Justice to the utmost, i. e. whatever is just; then must he do this Justice, of exercising his Prerogative and just Right in absolute Pardon, else here is some Justice not done: So that both ways, either in punishing, or not punishing, God exercises his just Right, and acts as justly in the one as in the other, if we only respect the nature of mere Justice.

You ask, pag. 4. If Forgiveness without Satisfaction be call'd Justice? and you make your Socinian answer, No; when he wou'd say, Yes, if he might speak for himself: But he is in your hands, and you make him speak what you wou'd have him, to make you Sport; which is the great Privilege of them who write Controversy by way of Dialogue. I say then, that free Pardon is Justice, as our Alms is call'd Righteousness in Scripture; for this reason, among others, say some, because they must be given of such things as we have a Right to: So God's pardoning Mercy is Righteousness, as much as his Bounty is so, as being the exercise of his just Right. Punishing is one Act of Justice, and Pardoning another; either way God uses his own Right with equal Justice. So that you give no manner of Proof of its being essential to Justice, that it must always punish to the utmost Desert. And indeed since Forbearance is a real Remission of all that Punishment which the Sinner might have suffer'd in that time, you may as well say, that Justice is not done in God's long Forbearance of the Wicked, as in his absolute Pardon of the Penitent; nay, in his Forbearance of Devils too, on whom Justice



Justice is not fully executed yet, but they are forgiven a great part of their Torment till the last day; and yet this is without any Satisfaction, unless you suppose Christ satisfy'd so far for Devils too.

And as your Ground for the Necessity of full Satisfaction fails, viz. from the Nature of God, and his Justice; so I suppose will theirs, who found the Necessity of full penal Satisfaction upon the Threatnings of the Law, as some; or upon a regard to the ends of Government, and the common Good, as others.

I find even some rigid Calvinists will not go so far as you, to lay this Necessity so boldly on the Nature of God, but only on his voluntary Determination. *The Injustice of not punishing any Sin* (says Dr. Owen) *arises not from any natural Obligation, but from a positive Act of God's Will. Treat. of Redemp. p. 93, 144.* This positive Will being suppos'd to be declar'd in the Threatnings of his Law, before Man sinned, let us examine what Necessity of full Penal Satisfaction is manifest from the Threatnings of the Law. Tho, I think, this founds the Satisfaction originally on mere Will and Dominion, which made a Necessity that did not arise from any natural Obligation; and therefore 'twill be a great Presumption against this Opinion, that 'tis not likely a most gracious God shou'd exert such a positive Act of mere Will; yet I find no such thing in the Law it self. The Threatning was, *Thou shalt die*, Gen. 2. 17. and the Sentence pass'd upon him in pursuance of that Law was, *Thou shalt return to the Dust*, Chap. 3. 19. And this is fully executed on Men themselves; so that there is no need for a Substitution or Satisfaction, to take it off: and 'twill be very hard for Men to suppose a secret Meaning of that Threatning, viz. that it includes eternal Torments, and then upon that Supposition to suppose a Necessity of a full Execution of that meaning of the Threatning on every Sinner.

But as I will not deny, that the continuance under Death was imply'd in that Sentence; so I judg, that whatever future Miserys might be imply'd in that Threatning (as I grant they are in others) yet that Threatnings, consider'd barely in themselves, do not bind the Lawgiver, in strict Justice, to inflict 'em on every Sinner who repents. For even the Sentence of returning to Dust was not executed on Enoch nor Elias; nor will it be on those who shall not sleep, but shall be chang'd, 1 Cor. 15. 51. Who

knows but the Threatnings of the first Covenant were as conditional as to future Miserys (supposing them intended in Gen. 2. 17.) as the Threatnings in the Gospel, 1 Cor. 3. 17. Gal. 5. 21. Rev. 21. 8. These are deliver'd in as absolute Terms as the first Threatning was, and yet we say they are not intended to be executed, if there be Repentance; only temporal Miserys, viz. Death, &c. are peremptorily determined. Perhaps God, whose merciful Nature was the same at first, never dealt with frail Man (as the History shews him to be easily ensnar'd) on other terms than these; he might threaten future Miserys, but we have no reason, that I see, to say his Threatnings were not conditional, and left no reserve for Repentance, as now. I know a thousand precarious things are said of the first Covenant, and Covenant of Works with Man in Innocency, requiring perfect Obedience, as the Condition of Life eternal, and admitting no Repentance; of which things I find not the Holy Scriptures say a word; and I doubt if such a Covenant be either surable to the Nature of a gracious wise God, nor the Nature of Man, in his unexperient'd feeble Innocency. Our common Systems do most pitifully suppose, and then build all on this, which shou'd be well prov'd, before it be laid for a Foundation. Now if the Threatnings were conditional, then on Repentance they were to be suspended of course without any Execution due.

But if eternal Miserys were threatned, and absolutely denounc'd against the Sinner, yet considering what has been said of the Nature of Justice, and that Non-execution wrongs none in their Rights (for even God's Right to punish remains, tho he forbear to exercise it) I can't see any thing can be pretend'd for the Injustice of not executing the Threatning, but this, That 'tis against Truth, a wrong to the Veracity of God, and a wrong to Men, as 'tis a sort of Justice due to them, not to deceive 'em.

To which I answer, That whatever the certain natural Consequence of Sin may be, to render an incorrigible Sinner miserable; and whatever Engagements may be on the Wisdom and Holiness of God, as Rector of the World; nay, whatever Engagement may be upon his Truth on other Accounts, to exact the threatned Punishment on the irreclaimable Sinner; yet the bare Threatning does not, I conceive, engage his Truth, because Threatnings are not like Predictions, nor are wont to be understood to

signify what is expected the Divine to the Man without

If the Threatning be the same still, even if it be not; but the Sinner is not punctual in his obedience to God's promise, nor the Threatning a Notion from Deity principally; Debt: The Threatning was a condition, is the Threatning a condition of Justice in a point of a thousand that I am not together a so that Truth. It is as if there is a Truth always in all Sin enough infinite judge 2. I find to lay the the reg and the Men from Thun D 19. For saying the to on behal But si a fore fig.



signify what shall certainly be, but what may be expected: they are not given for a Pledge of the Divine Veracity. Death was threatned to the Murderer, and yet God said to David, without being false, *Thou shalt not die.*

If the Divine Truth were at stake in every Threatning, I don't see but the same Injustice, i.e. the same Untruth, might be charg'd on God still, even tho *J. Ch.* had suffer'd the Equivalent; because the Law or Threatning did never say, that Christ, or some Substitute, shou'd die, but the Sinner. And there seems to be as little punctual Truth observ'd in Christ's suffering the Punishment instead of the Sinner, as in God's pardoning him absolutely; for when Christ suffer'd, it was neither the same Person, nor the same kind of Punishment that the Threatning spake of. And if it be a right Notion of Dr. Owen, that *Personal Guilt* differs from Debts in this, that the Person himself is principally intended, and aimed at, and not the Debt: Then it will follow, that the Threatning was not accomplish'd in its principal Intention, when Christ suffer'd; and then where is the Truth of the Threatning accomplish'd? Justice may admit an Exchange, but Truth lies in a point. Thus if I tell my Creditor I am worth a thousand Pounds in Land, and it be found, that I am worth it only in Cattel, or Shipping, it may seem just enough, and my Credit is altogether as good, but I shall be counted a Liar: so that the Equivalent does not answer the Truth. Yet I suppose the Divine Truth is as exact as his Justice. Wherefore I conclude, that there is no Necessity, either upon the Justice or Truth of the most Holy God, that he must always execute the utmost of his Threatnings on all Sinners, even the most penitent. 'Tis enough that he uses his Right or not, as in his infinite Wisdom, Goodness, and Sovereignty he judges best.

2. I find most of our considerate late Writers do lay the Necessity of Christ's Satisfaction on the regard that is due to the Ends of Government, and the common Good of Men, by deterring Men from Sin, by this Instance of Punishment. Thus Dr. Stillingfleet, *Reasoning of Christ's Suffering*, p. 47, Preface, p. 39. For tho this Doctor avoids saying 'twas necessary, yet he says, 'twas agreeable to Justice to admit of Christ's Satisfaction on behalf of the Penitent, on this Account.

But since the ends of Government, and the means to serve those ends, consist not in a point, but

admit of great Latitude, I think this will devolve the matter upon the Dominion and Wisdom of God at last, who may chose what way he shall take in this Affair; and if he can but maintain, or has provided for the Honor of his Law, without an equivalent penal Satisfaction, then there is no Necessity for it.

Now the Unitarians judg, that the Honor of God, and a regard to his Laws, are abundantly provided for without it, viz. by his limiting the Conditions of free Pardon and Salvation; so as that none can partake hereof but those who repent, and forsake their Wickedness, and sincerely submit to his Laws, while the rest are doom'd to perish. In this are contain'd all reasonable Motives to Obedience, as absolutely necessary, and all possible Arguments to deter us from wicked Acts. Here is no more Encouragement given Men to go on in Sin, than if Christ had satisfy'd for 'em; which wou'd certainly give as much Hope to the most daring and dilatory Sinner: and I am confident Sinners wou'd presume as much on the Satisfaction of Christ, as they do, or wou'd do, on the free Mercy of God, even while they go on in Sin. And here is as much to deter Men from Sin, as if Christ had been punish'd for 'em; for I can't think the World will ever be made to think the Sufferings of Christ, for a few Hours, to be more terrifying, or to give 'em a more dreadful Sense of Divine Wrath, than the endless Horrors of Hell-Torments in unquenchable Fire. If this will not deter 'em from Sin, the other will not; and they have already the same Grounds to believe Hell-Torments, as are pretended for Christ's infinite Sufferings: nay, if they don't first believe the Wrath to come, on the Credit of the Text, they'l not believe Christ suffer'd to take it off. So that it seems neither to add to the Terror, nor the Assurance of it, to say Christ made such Satisfaction for the eternal Torments due.

To which if we add the sad Abuses of the Doctrine of an equivalent Satisfaction by so many, to their hardning and Security in Sin; and also how much this Doctrine seems to diminish of the Glory of God's free Grace, in unmerited Pardon of the Upright; it may perhaps appear, that the Honor of God's Government, and the Ends of Piety, are at least as well provided for by free Pardon, as by an equivalent Satisfaction. Certain it is, that Love to God is the noblest Root of all pious Endeavors;



Justice is not fully executed yet, but they are forgiven a great part of their Torment till the last day; and yet this is without any Satisfaction, unless you suppose Christ satisfy'd so far for Devils too.

And as *your Ground* for the Necessity of full Satisfaction fails, viz. from the *Nature of God*, and his Justice; so I suppose will *theirs*, who found the Necessity of full *penal Satisfaction* upon the Threatnings of the Law, as *some*; or upon a regard to the ends of Government, and the common Good, as *others*.

1. I find even some rigid *Calvinists* will not go so far as you, to lay this Necessity so boldly on the *Nature of God*, but only on his voluntary Determination. *The Injustice of not punishing any Sin* (says Dr. Owen) *arises not from any natural Obligation, but from a positive Act of God's Will. Treat. of Redemp. p. 93, 144.* This positive Will being suppos'd to be declar'd in the Threatnings of his Law, before Man sinned, let us examine what Necessity of full Penal Satisfaction is manifest from the *Threatnings of the Law*. Tho, I think, this founds the Satisfaction originally on *mere Will and Dominion*, which made a Necessity that did not arise from any *natural Obligation*; and therefore 'twill be a great Presumption against this Opinion, that 'tis not likely a most gracious God shou'd exert such a positive Act of mere Will; yet I find no such thing in the Law it self. The Threatning was, *Thou shalt die*, Gen. 2. 17. and the Sentence pass'd upon him in pursuance of that Law was, *Thou shalt return to the Dust*, Chap. 3. 19. And this is fully executed on Men themselves; so that there is no need for a *Substitution* or Satisfaction, to take it off: and 'twill be very hard for Men to suppose a secret Meaning of that Threatning, viz. that it includes eternal Torments, and then upon that Supposition to suppose a Necessity of a full Execution of that meaning of the Threatning on every Sinner.

But as I will not deny, that the continuance under Death was imply'd in that Sentence; so I judg, that whatever *future Miserys* might be imply'd in that Threatning (as I grant they are in others) yet that Threatnings, consider'd barely in themselves, do not bind the Lawgiver, in strict Justice, to inflict 'em on every Sinner who repents. For even the Sentence of *returning to Dust* was not executed on *Enoch* nor *Elias*; nor will it be on those *who shall not sleep*, but *shall be chang'd*, 1 Cor. 15. 51. Who

knows but the Threatnings of the first Covenant were as conditional as to future Miserys (supposing them intended in Gen. 2. 17.) as the Threatnings in the Gospel, 1 Cor. 3. 17. Gal. 5. 21. Rev. 21. 8. These are deliver'd in as absolute Terms as the first Threatning was, and yet we say they are not intended to be executed, if there be Repentance; only temporal Miserys, viz. Death, &c. are peremptorily determined. Perhaps God, whose merciful Nature was the same at first, never dealt with *frail Man* (as the History shews him to be easily ensnar'd) on other terms than these; he might threaten future Miserys, but we have no reason, that I see, to say his Threatnings were not conditional, and left no reserve for Repentance, as now. I know a thousand precarious things are said of the first Covenant, and Covenant of Works with Man in Innocency, requiring perfect Obedience, as the Condition of Life eternal, and admitting *no Repentance*; of which things I find not the Holy Scriptures say a word: and I doubt if such a Covenant be either surable to the Nature of a gracious wise God, nor the Nature of Man, in his unexperienc'd feeble Innocency. Our common Systems do most pitifully suppose, and then build all on this, which shou'd be well prov'd, before it be laid for a Foundation. Now if the Threatnings were conditional, then on Repentance they were to be suspended of course without any Execution due.

But if eternal Miserys were threatned, and absolutely denounc'd against the Sinner, yet considering what has been said of the *Nature of Justice*, and that *Non-execution* wrongs none in their Rights (for even God's Right to punish remains, tho he forbear to exercise it) I can't see any thing can be pretended for the Injustice of not executing the Threatning but this, That 'tis against Truth, a wrong to the Veracity of God, and a wrong to Men, as 'tis a sort of Justice due to them, not to deceive 'em.

To which I answer, That whatever the certain natural Consequence of Sin may be, to render an incorrigible Sinner miserable; and whatever Engagements may be on the Wisdom and Holiness of God, as Rector of the World; nay, whatever Engagement may be upon his Truth on other Accounts, to exact the threatned Punishment on the irreclaimable Sinner; yet the bare Threatning does not, I conceive, engage his Truth, because Threatnings are not like Predictions, nor are wont to be understood to

signify expected the Div to the M without

If th Threatn the sam still, eve lent; be say, tha but the S punctual the Pun God's p Christ f nor the Threatn Notion from De principally Debt: T ning wa tion, is the Tr Justice n in a poin a thousa that I an I may se gether a so that Truth. as bi there is or Truth always e on all Si enough infinite judge

2. I find to lay th the rega and the Men fro Thus D 19. Pres saying 'le to on beha But si to serve



signify what shall certainly be, but what may be expected: they are not given for a Pledge of the Divine Veracity. Death was threatned to the Murderer, and yet God said to David, without being false, *Thou shalt not die.*

If the Divine Truth were at stake in every Threatning, I don't see but the same Injustice, i.e. the same Untruth, might be charg'd on God still, even tho *J. Ch.* had suffer'd the Equivalent; because the Law or Threatning did never say, that Christ, or some Substitute, shou'd die, but the Sinner. And there seems to be as little punctual Truth observ'd in Christ's suffering the Punishment instead of the Sinner, as in God's pardoning him absolutely; for when Christ suffer'd, it was neither the same Person, nor the same kind of Punishment that the Threatning spake of. And if it be a right Notion of Dr. Owen, that *Personal Guilt* differs from Debts in this, that the *Person himself is principally intended, and aimed at*, and not the Debt: Then it will follow, that the Threatning was not accomplish'd in its principal Intention, when Christ suffer'd; and then where is the Truth of the Threatning accomplish'd? Justice may admit an Exchange, but Truth lies in a point. Thus if I tell my Creditor I am worth a thousand Pounds in Land, and it be found, that I am worth it only in Cattel, or Shipping, I may seem just enough, and my Credit is altogether as good, but I shall be counted a Liar: so that the Equivalent does not answer the Truth. Yet I suppose the Divine Truth is as exact as his Justice. Wherefore I conclude, that there is no Necessity, either upon the Justice or Truth of the most Holy God, that he must always execute the utmost of his Threatnings on all Sinners, even the most penitent. 'Tis enough that he uses his Right or not, as in his infinite Wisdom, Goodness, and Sovereignty he judges best.

2. I find most of our considerate late Writers do lay the Necessity of Christ's Satisfaction on the regard that is due to the Ends of Government, and the common Good of Men, by deterring Men from Sin, by this Instance of Punishment. Thus Dr. *Stillingfleet*, *Reasons of Christ's Suffering*, p. 47, 39. Preface, p. 39. For tho this Doctor avoids saying 'twas necessary, yet he says, 'twas agreeable to Justice to admit of Christ's Satisfaction on behalf of the Penitent, on this Account.

But since the ends of Government, and the means to serve those ends, consist not in a point, but

admit of great Latitude, I think this will devolve the matter upon the Dominion and Wisdom of God at last, who may chose what way he shall take in this Affair; and if he can but maintain, or has provided for the Honor of his Law, without an equivalent penal Satisfaction, then there is no Necessity for it.

Now the Unitarians judg, that the Honor of God, and a regard to his Laws, are abundantly provided for without it, viz. by his limiting the Conditions of free Pardon and Salvation; so as that none can partake hereof but those who repent, and forsake their Wickedness, and sincerely submit to his Laws, while the rest are doom'd to perish. In this are contain'd all reasonable Motives to Obedience, as absolutely necessary, and all possible Arguments to deter us from wicked Acts. Here is no more Encouragement given Men to go on in Sin, than if Christ had satisfy'd for 'em; which wou'd certainly give as much Hope to the most daring and dilatory Sinner: and I am confident Sinners wou'd presume as much on the Satisfaction of Christ, as they do, or wou'd do, on the free Mercy of God, even while they go on in Sin. And here is as much to deter Men from Sin, as if Christ had been punish'd for 'em; for I can't think the World will ever be made to think the Sufferings of Christ, for a few Hours, to be more terrifying, or to give 'em a more dreadful Sense of Divine Wrath, than the endless Horrors of Hell-Torments in unquenchable Fire. If this will not deter 'em from Sin, the other will not; and they have already the same Grounds to believe Hell-Torments, as are pretended for Christ's infinite Sufferings: nay, if they don't first believe the Wrath to come, on the Credit of the Text, they'l not believe Christ suffer'd to take it off. So that it seems neither to add to the Terror, nor the Assurance of it, to say Christ made such Satisfaction for the eternal Torments due.

To which if we add the sad Abuses of the Doctrine of an equivalent Satisfaction by so many, to their hardning and Security in Sin; and also how much this Doctrine seems to diminish of the Glory of God's free Grace, in unmerited Pardon of the Upright; it may perhaps appear, that the Honor of God's Government, and the Ends of Piety, are at least as well provided for by free Pardon, as by an equivalent Satisfaction. Certain it is, that Love to God is the noblest Root of all pious Endeavors;



vors; and as certain that the less free Grace we believe there is in God's Pardon, the less we shall love him: for to whom little is forgiven, the same will love but little, Luke 7. 47.

Besides, 'tis not for us in dubious Matters to say this or that is the wisest way, therefore God must take it; there being nothing we are less proper and certain Judges of than these Matters of Wisdom, which require a mighty Comprehension and Capacity. If we must judg that to be the wisest Method of Divine Government, which is back'd with the highest Severity, and most sensible Representations of God's Anger, we shou'd perhaps think, that to serve the ends of Government it were necessary God shou'd smite upon every presumptuous Crime: for if on each wilful Crime he shou'd take away a Limb, or cause a Paroxysm of the Cholick or Gout to seize the Offender; and this became a certain fix'd Method, that a Man could not doubt of such a mark of speedy Vengeance; probably this severe way might deter Men more from Sin than either Christ's Sufferings or future Torments. Yet we must not say, God uses this Method, or that 'tis necessary, when we see the contrary; no more must we fancy a necessity of a Satisfaction without proof. Now since there is no Necessity of an *equivalent Satisfaction* to be made out *a priore*, either from the Nature of God's Justice, from his Law, or *Reasons* of Government (which last I confess you deride) I don't see but Pardon, or not punishing, is a matter of God's Dominion, but always under the Conduct of Wisdom, Holiness, and Goodness, and therefore is gratuitously exercis'd on an *humble Penitent*, where it may be so without any Prejudice to the Interest of true Piety, and I think without any absurd Consequence.

I wonder to find Dr. *Stillingsfleet* object so weakly against this Dominion in Pardon, which the *Unitarians* assert (*Christ's Sufferings*, p. 28, 29.) If, says he, the whole Right of Punishment depends on God's Dominion, then all Sins must have equal Punishments. This is a very strange Inference, that because God may punish as he pleases, therefore he must needs punish all alike, and observe no proportion of Fault and Punishment. And yet in the same Breath he adds, Then it were at liberty for God to punish a greater Sin with less Punishment, and a less with greater. This is still more strange, that two such contradictory Consequences shou'd follow from the same Premi-

ses, viz. both that all Punishments must be equal, and yet that they may be unequal. He goes on, Punishment wou'd then be a mere arbitrary Thing, depending on the mere Will of God. No more I think than in his Preface he had made it to be; nor is it mere Will, but attended with Wisdom, Holiness, and Equity in all its Determinations. He adds, that then God may punish whom he pleases (he means any innocent Man) and wonders that the *Socinians*, who assert the Right of Punishment to be merely in God's Dominion, shou'd cry out of the Injustice of punishing one Person (Christ) for the Faults of another. And tho he produces this as their Reason, and I think a very good one too, viz. that Punishment supposes Guilt, and so restrains his Dominion in punishing to the Guilty only: yet the Doctor will have it, that they contradict themselves to serve an Hypothesis, in saying, that God may by his Dominion forbear to punish a guilty Man, and yet that he cannot extend his Dominion to the punishing an innocent Man; notwithstanding the *Socinians* never pretend God's Dominion gives him Right to punish all that are under it, but only the Guilty; and that among them his Dominion gives him a Right also not to punish where he sees that best.

I think if the *Unitarians* be rightly understood, the matter is very clear, they'll grant that Right to punish is founded on Dominion, but yet upon Justice too. I may not be punish'd by one, merely because he is over me, without any Desert of mine; so that there must be Justice at the bottom: and yet I may not be punish'd for my Fault by every one that has no Authority over me, so that there must be Dominion also, as the Foundation of a Right to punish. But then this being only a Right, not an Obligation on God, 'tis no more than a Right to punish if he will; and consequently the Exercise of this Right, or not Exercise, is a point of mere Dominion. There must be inherent Guilt to found a Right to punish; but nothing but Choice and Wisdom is needful to use it, or to suspend its Exercise. So that the *Socinians* speak very consistently, when they assert God's Dominion in free Remission of the guilty Penitent, but deny it to extend to the Punishment of the innocent Jesus, or any other; i. e. he may part with his Right, and yet may not do wrong. So then if not to punish belong to the Divine Dominion, there will be no necessity of your full Satisfaction in order to Pardon. Nor can you argue that

any such  
vine Ple  
cause Pa  
merited  
the nat  
And  
thus to  
lenting  
a mode  
from be  
beautiful  
of Dom  
God's C  
all, and  
with 8h  
there se  
upon h  
Vicious  
nitent:  
a Met  
ment,  
every  
that th  
verfys,  
would  
is an  
Pardon  
be just  
God's  
them v  
preten  
But  
taken  
an infi  
for us  
Justice  
but de  
under  
2. S  
that t  
Gospe  
tion o  
Justice  
the Sin  
intend  
Sacrifi  
under  
fer'd  
full E  
latter  
for if  
flicted  
low th

any such thing is at all design'd, until the Divine Pleasure to have it so be produc'd; because Pardon may be granted by absolute unmerited Remission, for ought that appears from the nature of God's Justice.

And 'tis plain, that in human Governments, thus to forgive *penal Debts*, to the humble relenting Offenders, making a difference between a modest and impudent Transgressor, is so far from being a Defect in Government, that 'tis a beautiful Royalty, and one of the greatest Graces of Dominion. Much less is it any Defect in God's Government, who is absolute Lord of all, and who can't be impos'd on, as Men may, with *Shews of Mock-Repentance*; especially since there seem more ill Consequences to follow upon his long Forbearance of the obstinately Vicious, than from his free Pardon of the Penitent: and yet even that is not too destructive a Method to the ends of righteous Government, to be admitted by the wise and just God every day. The *Papists* don't prove to me, that there is an *universal visible Judge of Controversys*, by their bold saying, that else God would not be wise; no more do you prove there is an infinite Satisfaction made in order to Pardon, by saying, that else God would not be just. It only shews you are very bold with God's Attributes, as if you comprehended them well enough, tho an *Unitarian* must not pretend to fathom the Divine Unity.

But because you may say, that God has taken this Method of Choice, to forgive upon an infinite Satisfaction, and that this is enough for us to know; Whether he was bound to it by Justice or not, is no great matter, if he have but determin'd upon this way; I therefore add under the

2. *Second General*, That the *Unitarians* deny that the Lord Jesus Christ is ever said, in the Gospel, to have made any such infinite Satisfaction or equivalent Compensation to vindictive Justice, by bearing the full Punishment due to the Sins of Men; or that any such thing is intended by his being our *Ransom*, or being a *Sacrifice for us*, &c. Here two things come under consideration: 1. Whether J. C. suffer'd proper Punishment? 2. Whether it was a full Equivalent to strict Justice? 'Tis upon the latter that the main stress of the Cause lies: for if only some smaller Punishment was inflicted than what all Sin deserv'd, it will follow that compleat Satisfaction to Justice is not

made; and so 'tis only a merciful Composition made for the Sinners Debts, by an *Acceptilation* of less than an Equivalent.

1. As to Christ's being punish'd in a proper sense, by divine vindictive Justice, the *Unitarians* are afraid it will imply him to be a Sinner, according to their Notion of Punishment; which is this, That 'tis Misery inflicted by the Law-giver or Ruler on a Malefactor for his Crime, whereas the Holy Jesus was without Sin. And according to this common Notion the *Antinomians* do rightly argue, that if the Lord Jesus was punish'd, he must first have all our Wickednesses and our Faults imputed to him, and be as sinful as we, which we should abhor the Thoughts of; which yet their Adversarys cannot answer, but by going off from the obvious and most proper Notion of Punishment, when they say Christ was punish'd for our Sins, and by giving a more lax and mild sense of the Term Punishment; in which the *Unitarians* and they are at no great odds. They both agree in this, that vicarious Punishments or Sufferings are not so properly Punishments, as where there is personal Guilt. The judicious Mr. *Hotchkis* says, *Christ was not properly punish'd. Christ's Righteousness*, Part I. p. 77. Mr. *Baxter* says, it was but analogically such, that is, was not truly Punishment, but had a resemblance of it. See Dr. *Stillingfleet's second Part of Christ's Satisfaction*. And this Doctor himself, after all his vain Labor to make Mr. *Baxter* differ from the *Socinians*, is forc'd to own, that Christ's Sufferings were not a Punishment in the most proper and strict sense, p. 171.

Now the very *Racovian Catechism* says, That Christ suffer'd the *quasi poenam*, that is, the analogical Punishment of Mr. *Baxter*, &c. And since Dr. *Stillingfleet* himself, by Punishment, means only what was appointed and accepted in order to Atonement for Sin, p. 151. and by Atonement, That in consideration of which, God is willing to release the Sinner on the Terms of the Gospel, Part I. p. 307. I don't see any mighty Difference between him and the *Racovian Catechism*, which says, Our Sins were the Cause of Christ's Sufferings in order to their Pardon; *Eorum causa passus est & quasi poenam in se recepit, ut nos vera eorum poena exsolveret*: and that he suffer'd for Sins in the same sense that the Sacrifices under the Law did, chap. 8. Now since the Doctor and the *Socinians* agreed so well in their meaning, what reason was there to quarrel



with them about the Term *Punishment*, of which he grants the *Scripture speaks not a word*? Indeed they observe nothing in Scripture of God's Appointment in the Case (which the Doctor supposes and affirms) which in all solemn Punishments is expected.

'Tis certain God never did appoint and order the *Jews* to shed Christ's Blood; but on the contrary forbade 'em to kill him: when he sent him among 'em, 'twas to turn 'em from their Sins; and the end he propos'd was this, *Surely they will reverence my Son, and not kill him, as they did his Servants the Prophets, Mat. 22. 37.* And therefore to shew how they acted against his Will, God censures those *Hands as wicked* that kill'd him, and punish'd them with most dreadful but illustrious Vengeance, *Acts 2. 23.* I grant God did foresee the *Jews* Malice, and deliver'd his Son up, i.e. he left him in their Power; and it became his Duty to endure resolutely whatever befel him in doing his Father's Work: but still God did all, that by his Authority and Command he cou'd, to save him from harm. And was this *exemplary Punishment*, which the Lawgiver, instead of inflicting on him, did by his Authority seek to cover him from? Certainly such a terrible solemn Example of Divine Vengeance, as this is pretended to be, for striking Terror into the whole World; such a direful Instance of God's angry Justice flaming against the Sins of Men, to afright them beyond the far lesser Punishments of an *universal Deluge*, or a Storm of Fire and Brimstone, &c. I say, one wou'd think such a solemn Execution as this, design'd for publick Warning, shou'd have the plainest Marks of God's Hand in it. If it were just to inflict this as a Punishment on J. Ch. no doubt God might justly have commanded the *Jews* to slay him, and then it had look'd more like Punishment; whereas by a bare Permission or secret Will, it comes to pass that the most solemn Vindication of severe Justice was made to look like an *accidental thing*, and scarce to be distinguish'd from the ordinary Trials of the Saints, as to the ground of his Sufferings, and loses its true use. What publick Declaration is here of Divine Justice, when 'tis so hard to shew that it had any hand in it? Was it ever heard that a wise Ruler punish'd one by a grievous Death, for a demonstration of his severe Justice, which Death he forbids all his Subjects to inflict; and instead of that, commands

'em to reverence and obey him in all things; This would be to obscure and hide Justice, instead of declaring it, say the *Socinians*.

Indeed that Text, *Acts 4. 27, 28.* as translated, may mislead some to think, God determin'd the Rulers to crucify Ch. but if the *Nominative Case* be but plac'd before the Verb, as is natural, the true order of the Words will be thus, *Both Herod and Pontius Pilate were gathered together against this holy Child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed to do what thy Hand and Counsel determin'd to be done.* The last Words, *To do what thy Counsel determin'd,* may relate to Christ, see *Acts 10. 38.* not to the wicked Rulers; for God did not determine them to murder Christ, nor was he slain by the Wrath of God, his Father, but by the unrighteous Wrath of Men. 'Twould grieve one to hear such good Men as Mr. Jos. Allen telling us of God's cursing his own Son, saying to him, *Go thou Cursed, cursed in Body, cursed in Soul, &c. Remains, p. 193.* Methinks tho the *Jews made him a Curse, Gal. 3. 13.* Christians shou'd not hold him accus'd of God. The Prophet complains of the Injury done him by the *Jews*, who esteem'd him smitten of God and stricken, even when he was wounded for our Transgressions.

To conclude, I find God is often said to declare his Love to Sinners, in giving his Son to die for them, but never that he did it to shew his Wrath. He declar'd indeed his Righteousness, (or Clemency, as Dr. Hammond on the place) but how? not in punishing Sin, but in pardoning it, *Rom. 3. 25.* his Righteousness in the Remission of Sin, which is not an Act of vindictive Justice, but of rich Favor. Thus Christ shed his Blood for the Remission (not Punishment) of Sin, *Mat. 26. 28.* We are not so much as once call'd to take notice of God's Severity in this Affair.

But call it what you will, Suffering or Punishment, for our good, or in our stead; yet if it was not a compleat equivalent Punishment, as much as the severest Justice cou'd demand, or the World's Sin could deserve, 'tis nothing to your purpose of an infinite Satisfaction. Whether it was such, or not, is the next thing to be consider'd.

For 2. The *Unitarians* do absolutely deny, that J. C. suffer'd the *Tantulum*, or an Equivalent from vindictive Justice; I say, an Equivalent in the sense of strict Justice: for as for a prudential Equivalent, or rather Expedient, such as Mr. Baxter and others are for, viz. which may

answer



answer the ends of Government as much as if all Men had perish'd, and which may preserve Reverence for the Divine Law; this you call an *Intrigue of Politicks*, p. 30. and rightly add, that this will infer no necessity of Satisfaction, i. e. adequate infinite Satisfaction: for 'tis only a Satisfaction to the Divine Will and Prudence, not to inexorable Justice. And the Unitarians will own, that God's merciful Terms of Pardon thro Christ's Intercession, with the Sinner's Repentance, is such an Equivalent, or an Expedient, that better answers the ends of Government, and affords Arguments and Room for Obedience, more than if Sinners were left under Despair and Ruin.

But the Question is about an adequate Compensation to Justice for Sins past, not about a Security for the future; or whether to answer the Ends of Government, and the Honor of God's Law, it was necessary that the utmost Punishment due should be suffer'd without any Abatement? and whether our Lord Jesus made such a full Compensation, as was meritorious of our Discharge from the strictest Justice? for whatever is short of this cannot be infinite Satisfaction, since 'tis not equal to the Deserts of finite Merit.

Here then is the stress and heart of the Controversy between the Unitarians and Trinitarians about Christ's Satisfaction; which the former complain is not understood, at least is never attended to by their Adversarys. And in this critical Point, on which the whole Cause depends, as Dr. Outram waves it wholly, so I think Dr. Stillingfleet, in his *Reasons of Christ's Sufferings*, has most egregiously fail'd: for after he had own'd that the Unitarians acknowledg Christ to have been an expiatory Sacrifice for Sin, and that they freely had told the World what were the main Points in Controversy, viz. 1. Whether Jesus Christ made an adequate Payment to the Justice of God, or an Equivalent for what Men should have suffer'd? 2. Whether it was a Satisfaction offer'd to the Mercy of God, or to his Justice? I say, after this, he very subtly and unfairly drops the first and principal part of the Question, saying, *The main Point then between us is, whether Christ's Death had respect to the Justice or Mercy of God*; and so runs away upon a wrong Scent, retaining Metaphors and Allusions to the legal Sacrifices to little purpose, when he knew the equivalent Payment to Justice, and no other, was the main Business: for if another Man, or

an Angel were appointed for a Victim, this might be an Oblation to Justice; but not being an Equivalent, you despise such Satisfaction. So that the Equivalent is *all in all*, in this Dispute; which finding probably a little too troublesome, he had the wit to lay it aside, even tho he cites a Complaint of the Unitarians, that they were not rightly understood in this Point; and of himself they renew the Complaint, that he would not, or did not at least, seem to understand them by his Answer. So that whatever Esteem some may have for his Book, I can truly say 'tis nothing to the main Point which he had once before him, in his Pref. p. 9, 10. but left it out of his Book, whether to spare his Adversarys or himself, you may judg. In short, if less than an infinite and equivalent Satisfaction might do, then one less than God might give it. I speak this over again, because Men are not very willing to attend to this main Point.

Now that our Lord Jesus has not made such full Satisfaction as this, the Unitarians think is prov'd from this, that it would exclude all gratuitous free Pardon from God; which beyond all denial is so gloriously and expressly declar'd in the New Testament, forgiving one another, as God for Christ's sake has forgiven you, Eph. 4. 32. *ἐξαλείψατο*. We are justify'd freely by his Grace, thro the Redemption, &c. Rom. 3. 24. not only by Grace, but  *δωρεάν*, without any meritorious Cause, as 'tis John 15. 25. Now how can God be said to pardon Men gratis, if it be purchas'd at full Price? What is left to be remitted, if what was worth ten thousand times as much more Pardon (even for a thousand Worlds) be paid for it? He forgives all, but abates not a Farthing, say you. Strange, that this should be call'd gratuitous Pardon! I know this Argument is old and common, but I never saw it yet answer'd.

'Tis oft said for answer, that tho Christ paid all, yet it cost the Sinner nothing. But to whom owes he Thanks for this? Is it to God as freely forgiving him, or to Christ who paid the whole due, which otherwise had never been remitted by God? But it comes freely to the Sinner; but, I say, not freely from God, if he sold it at full worth; only from Christ. But the Text says, *God freely forgives in Christ*. Well, but you'll say, it was God the Father's Mercy that he found out this way of Satisfaction, pag. 5. This is generally said, I doubt, in complement to



the Father, after Men have dishonor'd his Goodness: For indeed, 1. It is as much the Son's Contrivance as the Father's, according to your Scheme, nay more the Son's than the Father's; for we are told the Son is the *Wisdom of God*, and you expressly say, *Wisdom is the second Person of the Blessed Trinity*, p. 5. Now we know 'tis the part of Wisdom to find out deep Contrivances; so that the Son must be the immediate Contriver as well as Executor, and nothing is left for the Father but tremendous *inexorable Justice*. If you say *Mercy* put the Son upon contriving, you tell us that *Mercy* is the *third Person*; so that all the rich Grace that is left for the Father to shew, is only to accept a sufficient *able Surety* in room of a *non-solvent Debtor*, and to accept a full Payment at once of what else he must ever be receiving in Parts. Do you think such a thing would speak any great Goodness even in a Man?

2. But supposing God the Father finds out this Expedient, 'tis not an Expedient how he may *freely forgive*, but how he may be satisfi'd to a Farthing. If my Judge or Ruler finds and persuades another to pay him my penal Debt or Fine, I may be beholden to him for his Wisdom, and perhaps some Kindness; but I'll never say he *freely forgave my Debt*, which I saw paid him to the full: especially when I saw the poor Man, my Friend, toil and pinch, and grievously put to it to make up the Sum, with Tears, and Sighs, and Prayers that he might be spar'd. The same I would say in any other criminal Case, or wherever a Substitution can be admitted to give full Satisfaction: whatever Favor there may be, there is no gratuitous Forgiveness of *all the Debt*.

Dr. *Stillingsfleet*, who kept as much out of the way of this Argument as he could [unable, I judge, to look this Objection in the face in its full Strength] at last mentions it slightly and by halves, in the last Leaf of the *Reasons of Christ's Sufferings*. But tho he did by halves start it, I think he did not so much as half answer it. To the Objection of the *Inconsistency of the Freeness of God's Grace with Satisfaction*, he answers, that *Freeness of Grace is consistent with Conditions*; he means our *Repentance and Prayers*, and instances in *Abraham's Prayer for Abimelech's Pardon*, &c. I reply, Tho all Conditions be not inconsistent with Free Grace, yet all strictly meritorious Conditions are so; and therefore 'tis that in answer to the *Antinomians* Ob-

jections, they who assert Conditions of Pardon, do alway deny them to be meritorious, such as *Christ's Satisfaction* is said to be. Again, says he, *Remission is free when the Penalty is forgiven wholly, as we assert*: but others say, True, 'tis free when 'tis forgiven freely, but that there is no Remission, whatever you assert, from him, by whom nothing is remitted, no free *Forgiveness* at all, where all that was due was paid. If among Enemies Prisoners are on equal Terms exchange'd, none will say they were *freely releas'd*, or magnify the Generosity and Free Grace of the Enemy that let them go on such Terms, especially if Ten of the other side were given in exchange for One not so considerable.

He adds, that *Men under Defamation must vindicate themselves, tho they freely forgive the Authors of the Slander*: And shall not God? &c. I answer: That Men may forgive, and yet seek to bring their offending Brother to an Acknowledgment and Repentance of their Fault, and to ask Pardon, because 'tis not strict Satisfaction; and this way God takes still to vindicate his Honor, and forgives none that don't humble themselves and repent. But that Men are bound to take the Rigor of the Law against their Brother, or that ever they can be truly said of *Free Grace* to forgive their Brother, when no Submission will be accepted without the severest Satisfaction to a Farthing, is utterly deny'd. 'Twas time for the Doctor to end his Book here, when he cou'd not tell better what to say to this Objection, which if mention'd duly before as it ought, he might have given over sooner.

Only one thing more I find him pleading, viz. That *Pardon was not inconsistent with Sacrifices of Atonement, and why should it be more inconsistent with the Sacrifice of Christ?* I answer, 'Tis not said to be inconsistent with *Christ's Sacrifice*, but with his equivalent meritorious Satisfaction; and therefore Pardon agreed with the legal Atonements, because they were not a meritorious infinite Satisfaction. And if *Jews or Gentiles* had thought so, and yet own'd a gratuitous Remission, they were as inconsistent as others now are.

Nor does your Notion of Satisfaction seem absurd in Speculation only, but also to have a very pernicious Aspect on Practice: For since God's Forgiveness of us is propounded as a Pattern for our forgiving our offending Brethren, *Eph. 5. 32. Mat. 6. 11.* what will the meaning

meaning  
God bath  
interpretat  
full repa  
rigorous  
when y  
can pro  
them, d  
sue 'em  
God wo  
an equiv  
say you,  
say tha  
God is  
Method  
as well  
one, he  
in no o  
a fine  
cept of  
being  
teach u  
besides  
nishme  
becom  
mission  
the Lo  
that  
weakn  
an ho  
and o  
not to  
unless  
or Lif  
cumst  
Forgi  
thing  
tous  
Th  
Price  
of th  
bong  
vots  
and  
ye th  
bath  
Dr.  
the  
not  
the  
Lor  
the  
ter



meaning of those Words, *Forgiving one another as God hath forgiven you*, amount to by your Interpretation, but this, viz. When you have had full reparation, not abating one Tittle of due rigorous Punishment, then forgive all the rest, when you can demand no more; only if you can procure another to satisfy you better for them, don't refuse to accept it, but else pursue 'em into Misery, Prisons, and Death, as God would deal by you, unless there had been an equivalent strict Satisfaction, without which, say you, he forgives none? It avails nothing to say that we are in a private Capacity, but God is a Governor, who must observe different Methods; for since God, who is our Proprietor as well as Rector, forgives no other way but one, he can be a Pattern to us of Forgiveness in no other way but this. And thus you'll give a fine Account of that great Christian Precept of forgiving our Brother: And instead of being merciful as our Father in Heaven is merciful, teach us to be rigorous and severe as he, who, besides Repentance, requires the utmost Punishment due before he forgives. Whatever becomes of your Creed in that Article, the Remission of Sins, you'll give a sad Exposition of the Lord's Prayer, and of those two Precepts that are the Sum of the Ten Commandments, weakning the Motives of our Love to God, by an horrid Misrepresentation of his Mercy; and of our Love to our Neighbor, by teaching us not to forgive, tho he turn, and say, I repent, unless he make full Satisfaction, Eye for Eye, or Life for Life. Whatever difference of Circumstances there may be in the method of God's Forgiveness and ours, it must not be in any thing that subverts the Nature of free gratuitous Pardon.

The Text says, *Indeed ye are bought with a Price*, 1 Cor. 6. 20. but it means not any Price of their Pardon paid to God, but that he had bought them by his Mercys; or that the Favours God had expended upon them did merit and purchase their Service. So Deut. 32. 6. *Do ye thus requite the Lord, is he not thy Father that hath bought thee, hath he not made thee?* And thus Dr. Whitby rightly expounds 2 Pet. 2. 1. *Denying the Lord that bought them of God the Father, not of J. Ch.* (which some ignorantly apply to the Unitarians, as if they deny'd Christ to be Lord) and so *God hath purchas'd his Church with the Blood of his own Son* (as 'tis Acts 20. 28. after some Copys) or the Lord, i. e. Christ, has

purchas'd it with his own Blood (after others) i. e. he has obtain'd a Church, rescu'd them from Darkness and Sin, and merited that they should live to him who has died for them. I read of his redeeming Men to God, but not of redeeming any from God, by giving to him a full Price. Indeed the Terms Redeeming and Ransom are seldom us'd in Scripture, but in the metaphorical sense, for Deliverance out of Trouble, without regard to the paying a Price for it. Hence Israel was redeem'd out of Egypt, Deut. 7. 8. and Moses was their Redeemer, Acts 7. 35. λυτρωτής, their Ransomer, tho he paid no Price. And even where a Ransom in the most proper sense is given, it does not suppose an Equivalent, but whatever shall be agreed on. Exod. 21. 30, 32. *Thirty Shekels of Silver* was the Ransom of the most precious valuable Life, if it happen'd to be forfeited by the Law there mention'd; which was next to no consideration, if Lives were as precious then as now.

Nor can any such Satisfaction be infer'd from Christ's being a Sacrifice, a Propitiation, or Atonement, tho taken in the most proper sense (tho indeed he was a Priest only of the Order of Melchisedec, who did not sacrifice, that we find, only officiated by Benediction and Intercession, and not of Aaron) for I am satisfy'd the Jewish Victims themselves, that are alluded to in this matter, were not design'd for a full Compensation to Divine Justice. 'Tis evident they were Rites of humble Deprecation, and a sort of symbolical Signs of Confession, that they deserv'd to be serv'd as the Beasts were, while they implor'd Mercy to spare them. Nor does it appear, that their Sacrifices so much as respected any Satisfaction to Justice. What tho they were to avert God's Wrath, which Dr. Stillingfleet insists on? I think Divine Wrath may be averted by an Address to Mercy, and Forgiveness will prevent it as certainly as Satisfaction: however, 'tis certain there was in them an Address to Mercy, by which the Atonement was made; for if we look to that which was the most solemn Atonement, which gave that name to the Day on which it was made (at which time only the High Priest was to officiate, or could be a Type herein of Christ) we find, Lev. 16. that the Atonement was made with sprinkling the Blood seven times on the Mercy-Seat, within the Holy of Holys. This plainly taught, that 'twas by an Application to Mercy from Justice; 'twas Mercy the High



High Priest fled to; and this was not only to apply the Atonement made, but to make it, v. 17. This plainly figures out to us, that Jesus Christ obtains our Pardon within the heavenly Veil, by seeking it at the Throne of Grace, or Seat of Mercy. Besides this the High Priest took Incense with him, which is a Symbol of Prayer; and thus Jesus Christ still intercedes for Pardon as a grant of Favor, and in Heaven offer'd himself, *Heb. 9. 24, 25.* as Dr. *Whitby* shews clearly.

Thus the Scripture is so far from appropriating Christ's Atonement to his Death, that it gives more Virtue to his Intercession, *Rom. 8. 34.* *Who is he that condemneth? it is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again; who maketh Intercession for us.* His Resurrection being so requisite to his Intercession for Pardon, that the same Apostle says, *If Christ be not rais'd we are yet in our Sins, 1 Cor. 15. 17.* notwithstanding his Death: and the Reason of it is, because he rose again for our Justification, *Rom. 4. 25.* not only for a Proof of his Acceptance with God, which was for his own Justification, but that he might justify us. And on this 'tis, that the Apostle lays the stress of a Christian's Hope of Salvation by Christ, *Heb. 7. 25.* How often do we hear poor honest meaning Persons object to the Unitarians, How can Christ be a Saviour if he be not Supreme God? Now the Apostle, without mentioning his being God, gives a full Answer to such, *He is able to save to the utmost,* says he; But how so? Wherein does his Ability, for being so compleat a Saviour, lie? Because he ever lives to make Intercession for 'em. None will say, that Intercession is an Act that none but God can perform; sure 'tis the part of an Inferior rather. Now if his Intercession does justify as well as his Death, nay rather than it (which makes me wonder how Dr. *Stillingfleet* could ask the Question, *Why are not Men said to be justify'd much rather by Christ's Resurrection?* p. 299. when the Apostle does so expressly say it, rather he is risen) then it follows, since Intercession is not penal Satisfaction, that we are justify'd upon other terms.

2. Again, Legal Atonements were sometimes made in such a manner as had no shadow of Punishment, much less of a full Compensation, viz. by Immolation, or burning an handful of Meal, which suffer'd no Pain, and yet made as good an Atonement for the Poor, as shedding the Blood of a Beast did for the Rich, *Lev. 5. 12, 13.*

I know you speak contemptibly of a Sacrifice that had all its Virtue from God's Appointment; That God might as well have covenanted to pardon Man upon the turning of a Straw, p. 12. or upon the paring a Man's Nails, as Dr. *Stillingfleet* speaks, p. 272. Now I pray consider what more worth there was in an handful of Meal; therefore what the Text says, *Heb. 9. 22.* that under the Law, without shedding of Blood, is no Remission, must be taken, I conceive, with the Limitation that begins that Verse, *Almost all things,* &c. for here is a manifest Exception from that Rule. Nay, Atonement was made sometimes by burning a little Incense, *Num. 18. 47.* A Figure of Prayer; *Psal. 141. 2.* And sometimes Prayer it self was used for making Atonement, *Exod. 32. 30.* which shews us what 'tis to atone for Sin, 'tis not to satisfy for it, but with humble penitent Expressions to acknowledg Guilt, and to implore mere Mercy for averting deserv'd Punishment: And this answers to Christ's Intercession with God's Mercy, rather than to any treating with vindictive Justice.

3. Those legal bloody Sacrifices themselves appear to be rather penitential than satisfactory, and to have such sort of Influence upon Pardon as Repentance had, which is no Equivalent to Justice, but an Address to Mercy. This I gather from *Psal. 51. 16, 17.* David had committed Murder and Adultery, he is anxiously distress'd for Pardon; he inquires after a Sacrifice for Atonement, but finds none appointed in that case by Moses's Law: What must he do? Shall he despair because he had no expiatory Sacrifice? Can nothing serve for Expiation but Blood? Yes, says he, *the Sacrifices of God are a broken Heart,* i. e. they are a Sacrifice of Expiation, even such as the Law appoints for atoning some Sins, but not such as mine. And thus the Fathers (and Unitarians) allow Satisfaction to God to be made by Repentance, *Deo satisfacere liceat sive & penitentia,* Lactan. l. 4. c. 13. So Tertul. Basil, see Seller's Remarks on S. Cypr. Epist. And I think Repentance has all in it that Dr. *Stillingfleet* says of Atonement, *Chr. Suff. p. 59.* 'Tis Pain suffer'd for Sin, ordain'd of God, in order to Forgiveness, serves the Ends and Honor of Government, and is more strictly inflicted on us by God's Command, than Death was on Jesus Christ: but yet 'tis no equivalent Payment to Justice, while 'tis an atoning Sacrifice.



And I think you, Sir, make Christ's Satisfaction to lie in Christ's Repentance or Sorrow for our Sin, viz. in his Sense of Sin proportionable to the Offence, p. 21. which you call the utmost that Justice requir'd; tho a bare Sense of the Fault is no meritorious Compensation to Justice for an Injury, it only recommends one to Mercy. And you speak in this as if Christ's Atonement was made rather by shedding of Tears, than by shedding of Blood; for the former is the more proper Expression of a burden'd Spirit.

But to return to David's Sacrifice of a contrite Heart; I find Dr. Stillingfleet, p. 273. arguing against Crellinus (who asserted the Efficacy of the Sacrifice to depend on God's Appointment of it as a Condition) asks, *Why were not inward Sorrow for Sin, and Prayers and Tears rather made the only Conditions of Expiation, than such a chargeable Service?* Now in David's Case, under the highest Guilt, it was just so; no Sacrifice of Blood or Life was requir'd, only inward Sorrow, Tears, and Prayers. And therefore one might have ask'd the Doctor on the other hand; If the Design of the Legal Sacrifices was to teach the Jews, that no Pardon cou'd be had but upon Christ's Satisfaction, as he intimates, p. 274. Then, I pray, how came it to pass, that under the guilt of the deepest Dye, where Pardon seems most unlikely to be obtain'd, there shou'd be no Sacrifice at all appointed, but bare Repentance was accepted, without any bloody Offering, or the help of any Type to lead the Thoughts to Christ's Satisfaction? What, must one despair of Pardon without Christ's Sacrifice for lighter Faults, and yet do well without it, under the damning Crimes of Murder and Adultery? Or wou'd God have Satisfaction for, and teach Men to dread, lesser Errors, but not gross Wickedness?

In vain do some pretend to flee to the general National Atonement, as if these Crimes were pardon'd by it, for which no Sacrifices were particularly appointed: for as great Crimes require a more special Repentance, so likewise a more particular solemn Expiation; and 'tis strange if they shou'd pass off slightly by a general Atonement. Moreover, the Sinner might die according to the Law before that Day came: nor cou'd David say, there was no Sacrifice appointed in his Case, if it had been so. And St. Paul tells us, there were Sins from which Men cou'd not be justify'd any way by the

Law of Moses, Acts 13. 39. So that Repentance seems to be the only way left 'em for the Expiation of the greatest Guilt, which was a Procedure, not on the Law of Moses, but on the Principles of natural Religion, common to others.

I take the matter to be thus, That the Sacrifices alone did not purge the Conscience, but only took away the political Guilt, in relation to their Civil and Ecclesiastical Penalties; and therefore when the Crime was such as must not be pardon'd, but the Sinner must be put to death, then there was no room for a Sacrifice, because no Pardon cou'd be granted of that nature. But yet, with reference to God, and a future State, his Pardon was still to be sought by true Repentance, Isa. 1. 18. but without any bloody Sacrifice, as typical of Christ's Satisfaction. But when the Law allow'd Pardon, then Sacrifice was that Rite by which they sought it from God, as their State Ruler: And therefore, even in the matter of Adultery, which was by the Law made Capital, and therefore admitted no Sacrifice, from David; we find, that when in one Case the same Crime, for some Reasons, was not by the Law made Capital, then a Sacrifice was appointed, see Levit. 19. 21, 22. compar'd with Deut. 22. 24. Which makes it plain, that Sacrifices were us'd or not, according as the Crimes were expiable or not, in relation to temporal and political Punishments, not in relation to future Punishments (which is the end of Christ's Sacrifice) for then they wou'd have been most useful under the most heinous capital Crimes, where we find 'em wholly excluded, because they cou'd have no effect upon their temporal Punishment; and Repentance was the only Refuge from future Punishment.

Whence I infer, That tho this way of political Pardon might be typical of the Gospel way of eternal Pardon, by the Sacrifice of Christ's Obedience to Death, as their Canaan was of our heavenly Bliss; yet I see no manner of Pretence for what you suggest, p. 4. that the Jewish Sacrifices of Beasts deriv'd their Worth and Efficacy for Atonement from the Sacrifice of Christ: for the great Virtue of his Death seems wholly appropriated to the future Salvation from the Punishments of the World to come. It purges the Conscience, it effects our eternal Redemption, Heb. 9. and saves us from Wrath to come; but it does not take off the temporal Punishment of a Criminal, nor reverse the just



Sentence of the *Civil Law* or *State*. This is not the purpose of Christ's Death, to interfere with *State-Judicatorys*, or to save a Murderer from *Execution*: But 'tis apparent that this was the Design of the *legal Sacrifices*; and therefore how could they derive their Efficacy from Christ's Death, for those Effects, which the Virtue of Christ's Death has no Influence upon? What! Did Christ die to procure *State-Pardons* for Criminals? If not, how could those *Sacrifices*, that were us'd for that end, have their Virtue from *his*, that has no such Virtue ascrib'd to it? Christ's Virtue was of one kind, theirs of another. I wonder to see with what Assurance Men tell the World, that all the Efficacy of the *legal Sacrifices* was from Christ's Death, when the Scripture says not such a word. If it had been so, I think it had not fail'd to have been mention'd in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, where is no such thing, but only some *Allusions* of Christ's Oblation to the *legal Offerings*; making the *latter* to be Resemblances, Types or Figures of the *other*. But that might be, and yet they not have from it the least Efficacy for eternal Pardon: only Christ's Death had the like Efficacy (and greater in degree) for *eternal Pardon*, as the *legal Offerings* had for external and *temporal Pardon*; both of 'em did operate after the nature of *Sacrifices*, to the averting Wrath. But that the nature of a Sacrifice is not to make an equivalent Compensation for Crimes, is seen both from the small Value of the *Jewish Sacrifices*, of *Beasts, Incense, Meal, &c.* which were not in themselves of *equal Value* to the Soul or Life of Man, nor did borrow Virtue from Christ's Death to raise them up to such an Equivalent; and also from the nature of *Repentance*, which is with as exprefs Design declar'd by *David* to be an atoning Sacrifice, as ever Christ's Death is declar'd to be such in the *New Testament*; and yet cannot be deem'd to operate, by way of full Compensation to strict vindictive Justice, for heinous Crimes. The Sum of the whole is, that if Repentance was as efficacious a Sacrifice in the worst Crimes, as *Burnt Offerings* of *Beasts* were under smaller; and yet that Repentance imply'd no equivalent Satisfaction to rigorous Justice, any more than now it does; then it follows that the nature of an expiatory Sacrifice is not to make a full Satisfaction to strict Justice, even tho Mercy accept it for an Atonement, as it did a little Meal; and

consequently Christ's being an atoning Sacrifice, does not prove he was so by such an equivalent Satisfaction.

3. Supposing still that such an equivalent Punishment had been requir'd and paid by Jesus Christ, yet the *Unitarians* say this will not suppose it to be *Infinite*, or the Person that paid it to be so; 1. Because the Sin to be expiated, tho exceeding Evil, does not appear to be of infinite Demerit. Nothing is pretended for this, but its being against an infinite Object; but if that makes it so, then all Sin must be so for the same reason, as being against the same infinite God. But if all Sins are of infinite Guilt, then all must be of equal Guilt; since no Guilt can be aggravated beyond Infinite, which belongs to the least Sin; and equal Guilt deserves equal Punishment: and so there must be no Difference of Crimes, greater or less, one or many, the Guilt will be the same; nor any Difference of Punishments, no greater Condemnation; which is certainly false. And therefore if no better reason can be given to prove Sin of infinite Demerit than this, there is no reason to say God requires infinite Punishment to expiate it.

2. They don't see it possible that there should be infinite Satisfaction by infinite Punishment; because nothing that is infinite can suffer. God is impassible, and cannot deny, or diminish himself; and suppose what Union you please of the Deity to the Humanity of Christ, yet as nothing but the human Nature suffer'd, so that Nature, with all its Acts and Passions, remains still but finite. He was not an infinite Man, or an immense Creature, by being united to God: And his Suffering can hardly be counted infinite, any more than his Eating and Drinking; since the Deity no more suffer'd than it eat or drank. You may call it what you will, relatively or figuratively infinite, or by a logical Communication of Property; but severe jealous Justice is not to be cheated or blinded with Names and Terms of Art, while it sees nothing truly suffers but a frail finite Creature.

To talk of God's Suffering, and a God punish'd, or of one Person of the Trinity punish'd and curs'd by one of the other, and the third helping the second to bear the Vengeance of the first, is daring Boldness enough, but little to the Honor of God or Christianity. And at this rate the *Unitarians* Account makes his Sufferings as much infinite as yours; for they

freely

freely own a peculiar singular Union of God the Father to the Man Christ, who wrought his Works for him. John 14. 10. *The Father in me he doth the Works* (tho I suppose he did not suffer his Pangs) and this seems as honorable and as near a relation as others pretend; and yet they don't think he is made God by being united to God.

Besides, how can one infinite Sacrifice (if it be suppos'd) be an Equivalent for so many Myriads of infinite Sins? as a great Prelate of the Age has observ'd in one of his four Discourses. Will not each Crime need an infinite Sacrifice? If you say one Infinite is as much as many of the same kind, because it can have no addition; then you must remember that one Infinite Divine Person is as much as Three, and by this Rule the Unitarians have as complete an Object of their Faith and Worship as you. Nay it follows, if Sin be of infinite Guilt, and one and many are the same, that a whole Course of Debaucherys ought to sit as easy on the Conscience, as one single infinite Fault; and will not this be a fine way to make your Doctrine of Satisfaction a comfortable Doctrine!

You suppose there may be an infinite Suffering, in which you place Christ's Satisfaction, viz. in his having an infinite Sense of the infinite Demerit of Sin, p. 19, 20. because, say you, he had an adequate Notion of God. But this is either false, or nothing to the purpose: 'Tis false, if you mean that he had an infinite Sense of Sin, in his human Nature, as you suppose, p. 21. or an adequate Notion of God; for that finite Mind was not capable of finding out the Almighty to perfection: nay 'tis false, if you mean it of a sorrowful Sense of Sin (such as your Argument implies) tho you suppose his Divine Nature; for that cannot be afflicted personally, or have any truly sorrowful sense. But if you mean that he had a full Estimate of the Demerit of Sin in his Divine Comprehension, then 'tis to no purpose to call this Satisfaction; for so had God the Father as large and deep a sense as Christ could have, and express as much Grief (figuratively) and so had the Spirit also. At this rate they made Satisfaction too. So then as Man he had no infinite sense of Sin, as God the Father had the same.

The Sum of the Arguments thus far is this: If God did not require a strict Equivalent; if Christ did not pay such, nay, if an Equiva-

lent it self would not amount to Infinite, then was there no need of an infinite Person to make a finite Satisfaction, much less to be a Mediator and Intercessor with Divine Mercy.

But perhaps 'twould be well if you could get off so; for the Unitarians turn the Tables upon you, and from your very proof of Christ's Deity, think they raise an insuperable Objection against it, which runs thus: If, say they, Justice be, as you speak, of the very Essence of God, and 'tis of the Nature of Justice, and consequently of God, to require an adequate Satisfaction, p. 31. then if Christ have Divine Justice, i. e. the Divine Nature, and be God himself, he must also require such Satisfaction; but if he do not require it, he wants what is essential to God. No doubt you will say he is God, whatever follows. Well then, say they, is he the same just God who was offended by Mens Sins? Or are there two Gods, one who was offended by our Sins, and the other not? If he be the same God himself, then being the offended Party he must receive infinite Satisfaction; that is, must be as just a Person as his Father. But yet since 'tis he only makes the Satisfaction, it follows that he is not satisfy'd, unless he satisfies himself, which is no very terrible Instance of vindictive Justice.

Here then is the Dilemma in which you are caught: Either J. C. as God has given infinite Satisfaction to himself, which seems absurd; or he is not satisfy'd at all, and so is not God by your own account. Chuse whether of the Two you'll take. I find you offer at both, because you dare not stand to either.

1. You would have it no Absurdity for God to satisfy himself, pag. 2. and alledg vainly the Apostle's Words, God was in Christ, reconciling the World to himself (i. e. by sending the Apostles to persuade 'em to be so reconcil'd, 2 Cor. 5.) when you should have provid that God was reconciling himself to the World, and this by paying himself the full Price of their Pardon. Then you bring for a Parallel, an Instance of a Creditor who pays himself, by helping his Debtor to Stock, and Credit, and Preferment, &c. that he may be able to make Satisfaction for his Debt. But because any one will see that the Debtor pays the Debt out of his own Improvements, not out of the Creditor's own Purse, therefore you recant your own words; and having before suggested that the Creditor paid himself, you add, That because 'twas paid by the Debtor, 'tis not strictly



is call'd *satisfying himself*. But why then did you bring it for an Instance of that kind? 'Tis a strange way of illustrating a Point, by bringing an Instance for it, and then giving a good reason why it won't answer.

The like may be said of *David's giving to God*. 'Twas *David's Act*, to give what was in his own Power and Choice to have withheld. God did not give to himself, to make himself amends for any wrong *David* did him, which is your Case in hand, and seems very absurd. Wherefore,

2. In the next place, you would not have it thought that God satisfies himself. Therefore,

(1.) You say, *Man paid his Debt to God, enabled to it by God*, p. 3. What! does God enable finite Man to do an infinite thing? To pay infinite Satisfaction? It seems then that a mortal Man, with God's Help, can make sufficient Satisfaction for Sin. I thought that whatever is infinite, is in none but God alone; and consequently, that if any infinite Price be paid to God, 'tis paid by himself, to himself, and not by *Man*, as you say. No not by the *human Nature* of Christ, if that be your meaning; for infinite cannot come from finite, and that *Nature* is no more. If you say, the infinite Value comes from the *Divine Nature* united to it; then I say, his Divine Nature is satisfy'd by value receiv'd from it self, and so we are again where we were at first; and he still pays himself, which is a sort of Payment we don't oft hear of, especially where severe strict Justice has to do. And yet 'tis somewhat more harsh in case of *Punishment*, to take strict Satisfaction for one Abuse, by suffering another from the same hand. If this be tremendous full Satisfaction, then I don't see but our Blessed Saviour, in bidding us, when smitten, to turn the other Cheek, might intend not so much to teach us a Lesson of Patience, as to put us upon seeking rigorous Satisfaction by a second Blow. Thus I see you also can learn the Sophistry of not distinguishing between Debts and Punishments. But this being too absurd, you add, as your last Refuge,

(2.) That *God the Son paid the Satisfaction to his Father, one Person to another*; and so, say you, the Objection is wholly over. I perceive 'tis troublesome to you, and therefore you are in haste to have it over. But 'tis not over yet: This may account for Satisfaction to the Father, but still there is no Satisfaction to God the Son,

unless he has satisfy'd himself. The Question is, Did Jesus Christ satisfy the Father only (else the Difficulty remains still how he could satisfy himself) then who satisfies the Son? Can the Son be God, and yet not have Divine Justice essential to God? Or can his *Divine Justice* admit Men to Favor without a Satisfaction? Will it not then follow that vindictive Justice is not necessary to *God's Nature*, but that he can forgive without a Satisfaction, since God the Son does forgive without any, tho he have that same Nature? Why then can't God the Father forgive the same way? But if on the other hand, Christ be that very God, who can no more remit the least Farthing than cease to be, p. 47. and withal it be absurd for one to give penal Satisfaction to himself; which makes you say, *A Trinity is necessary to Christ's Satisfaction* (for else the Father alone might satisfy himself) then it follows we have *God the Son* to satisfy still, and so you have mended the Matter well. Are not we in as bad a Case as ever? For the Son has, according to you, as severe vindictive Justice as the Father.

And is not that a defective Expedient for our Redemption, that leaves us without Hope, unless we find another *Infinite Sacrifice* for the Son? Truly, Sir, I had much rather humbly trust in the rich Mercy of a gracious God, thro the Mediation and Intercession of the Lord Jesus, with a sincere Repentance and Obedience, without pretending to plead equivalent Merit and full Worth given him, for all the Favor or Good I want from him; than to offer a full Satisfaction to but one Divine Person, and nothing at all to the other two; who, according to you, are as able to destroy me as that other, and having the same Justice must needs be as inexorable as he, without a Satisfaction, had certainly been.

But to tell you the Truth, I verily believe, after all, that you and others of the same Opinion do not think J. C. has the same vindictive Justice which you attribute to his Father. You say he is God equal to the Father, but you represent him by your Scheme as much more gracious. And this I fear is the fatal tendency of your Notions, to derogate from the glorious Love and Free Grace of the Father of Mercys, and to exalt Jesus Christ above him, in the vulgar Esteem at least. The Father you call *Power*, p. 5. and represent him inexorable, without full Satisfaction to a Farthing; but

but J. C. him, the other, and satisfaction; any Comfort welcome him: N the Ex demands ple for more one re name of of his call a Preach God, is I fir than th made they b Mercy out th we tru as we an Equ to him free m be di more ses, a nefs purch nefs: Wou Pity, good who for God tisa Scho I gun defe as n with rash the ciet Aln Co An but

but J. C. so good and compassionate beyond him, that tho he be as much injur'd as his Father, and have as much Right to demand Satisfaction; yet he will remit all his Debt without any Compensation; a poor Penitent shall be welcom to his Favor, without any Price paid him: Nay so good, that he will himself be at the Expence to satisfy all the Father's Demands too at full Price. How can poor People forbear, by this Rule, to think and speak more kindly of J. C. than of God? Is this one reason that makes so many bow at the name of *Jesus*, who yet stand stiff at the name of *his God and ours*? Or that teaches others to call a Sermon of loving *Christ*, &c. spiritual Preaching, while one of loving and obeying God, is relish'd as dry Morality?

I find Men are more willing to trust *Christ* than the *Father*: So that if *Christ* have not made an infinite Satisfaction to the Father, but they be directed to hope in the Father's free Mercy, thro *Christ's* Intercession, they cry out they are undone and lost. Why so? Can't we trust the Father of Mercy? May not we as well hope for the Father's Favor, without an Equivalent, as for the Son's, without any given to him? We must be beholden to some one for free *unmerited* Favor; and why must the Father be dishonor'd with our despondent Jealousy more than another? Cannot he, if he pleases, as well be at so much Expence of Goodness to give, as *Christ* be at the Expence to purchase Favor? Is not he as rich in Goodness as the Son, who receives all from him? Would Men be more undone, if left to his Pity, of whom our Lord said, there is none good but one, that is God; than when left to his, who said, *Why callest thou me good?* Mat. 19. 17. for you must be left to the mere Pity of either God or *Christ*, unless you can produce a full Satisfaction made to both of them, which your Scheme of infinite Satisfaction will not allow of.

I think 'twere better to desist from such Arguments for *Christ's* Deity, till you are able to defend them, and till you can so manage them, as not to have them turn'd against your self with so much Force. But there's no ruling a rash indiscreet Zeal! How many Teachers tell their People, that *Christ* could not be a sufficient Saviour as Mediator, except he were God Almighty, who never consider the above said Consequences of making God a Mediator? And how many poor Creatures have I heard

speaking scornfully of *Christ* for a Mediator or Saviour (to whom *Christ* crucify'd seems to be a Stumbling-Block) if he could not make infinite Satisfaction by Suffering, who yet could not answer one of the Arguments against such Satisfaction? As if the Office and Love of the Redeemer were contemptible, unless they be enabled to claim Pardon and Salvation from God, as things he is sufficiently paid for; or as if 'twere nothing worth to them, that the blessed *Jesus* has so liv'd and died for them as to obtain the highest Acceptance with God, and the highest Power at his Right Hand, and then uses this Interest for them. I perceive they who so think, would never believe that *Jesus Christ* is able to save them to the utmost, for the Apostle's reason, viz. *Because he ever makes Intercession for them*, Heb. 7. 25.

As for your wild Antinomian Suggestions scatter'd up and down, about *Christ's* Suretyship, his being the Reconciler of Angels, who never offended, as well as of Men; your pretty Metaphors about being cloth'd in the Garments of our elder Brother (a bold word to use of Almighty God; for as *Christ* was Man, you'll not say but there are elder Brethren than he) your Talk of Darning and Cobbling, Rubbing and Scrubbing, Patching and Scouring, the filthy Rags of our best Righteousness, which the poor Dissenters have been jeer'd out of, by them of the Church, as nauseous Cant; your asserting all our best Performances to be Provocations, p. 45. These and many more such I can pass over, and impute them to a Weakness, which might consist with an honest Mind: But I cannot be so favorable to other Instances, which bear the Marks of design'd Dishonesty, when you insinuate that the Socinians deny Hell-Torments, p. 28. and use such a way to prove it.

The *Racovian Catechism* and other Writings expressly own eternal Punishments, and Dr. *Stillingfleet* cites them, as asserting, that God's Veracity is concern'd in the Execution of those Threatnings on the Impenitent. But you make your Socinian deny this, and charge him with believing no Hell at all; and to make out your Reproach, you most unrighteously have put the very Words of one of your Trinitarians upon the Socinian. So that should such Men as you (and Mr. Ed——ds) hereafter happen to be credited, such things will pass for Socinian Sayings, which either none of them did say, or at most did no more say than the Trinitarians themselves.



themselves. Almost whole Pages of Dr. Tillotson's Sermons on *Hell-Torments*, you have clapt slyly upon your Socinian, as if 'twas originally from a Socinian; and he, in distinction from others, must be charg'd with it. I know not but some, both of one Party and the other, may indeed approve that Sermon (and yet not at all deny *Hell-Torments*, which is your Inference only) But is the Socinian therefore to be upbraided by a Trinitarian, with what Words were originally the Trinitarian's own; and with a Doctrine that they have so publicly contradicted, as well as their Adversarys?

Thus again you make your abus'd Socinian to say, *He can't think it lawful to preach the Gospel against the Command of the Civil Government, without such a Commission as the Apostles had*, pag. 29. when they are the words of a Trinitarian, at the Head of a Trinitarian Church. And tho I will not justify their Practice, who after they have settled their judgments in that Persuasion of the Divine Unity, and have a fair Opportunity given them, do yet want the Zeal and Courage of a Christian, to confess with their Mouth what they believe in their Hearts, nay dare practise contrary to their Faith; who, in Matters of Moment, and in which the Honor of Christianity is so highly concern'd, are for having their Faith to themselves, in a sense the Apostle (tho speaking of minute Points only) never seems to have intended, *Rom. 14.* which only means, we should not uncharitably urge our Opinions and little Practices on others, not that we should not own, or practise, nor impart our Faith to the World: Yet I may truly say this is no Socinian Principle, witness the severe Sufferings they have oft endur'd under Trinitarians, and sometimes at the Stake, which with great Constancy they have embrac'd, long since the Reformation. But how do you prove this to be a Socinian Tenet? Is it any other way than this, viz. because you find a Trinitarian professing it? And not liking it in him, you unrighteously father it on the Socinian, tho none such appears ever to have been of that Mind.

These are your pious Frauds: because you could not raise Odium enough from their own Writings, you pick up any odious thing even out of the Writings of their very Opposers, and then make your Socinian to speak it, and this without naming the Author from whom you took the Passage. (Tillotson's Sermon on

*Josh. 24. 15.*) that it might look as if 'twere taken out of some Unitarian Tract which you pretend to be confuting. You might with the same Honesty, and from the same Authority, have told the World, that the Socinians own *three Persons in the one God*, and the Supreme Deity of a deriv'd Son. This, Sir, may pass for your Method with the Socinians.

Whether you intended to slur that illustrious Archbishop (whose noble Parts, great Integrity, and sweet Temper rendred him one of the brightest Ornaments of the Church and Age) by telling the World he was a Socinian, tho himself wrote against them; or intended rather to load the Socinians with others Faults, it matters not: for either way 'tis such an unrighteous deliberate Slander of your Neighbor, such false Witness born against him, that I hope for your own sake, you will not rely on Christ's Satisfaction for your Pardon without Repentance. I find indeed you profess not to stand or fall by your Sincerity at the great Day, p. 45. But whatever this Error may be in Speculation, I beseech you let's have no more practical Instances of renouncing Sincerity, because the World generally has some Kindness left still for that Vertue.

And I think this is enough to sink the Credit of any reproachful Storys which you don't vouch by others. This would lead me to reply, in the next Place, to your angry Reproaches and Censures of the Unitarians, which I might attempt, by inquiring whether to be like the Mahometans or Jews, in their Belief of the Unity of God; or like to Pagans, in their multiplicity of Divine Persons, be most criminal? Whether you do well in representing the Socinian, as being at a greater distance from the rest of the Christian Church, than the Mahometans? While these deny the Apostles Creed in the very Letter, deny that Christ is the Son of God, on which the Socinians build their strongest Arguments; deny that ever Christ was crucify'd, dead or bury'd, and that ever he rose from the Dead; who supersede his Laws (in subjection to which the very Essence of a Christian lies, more than in right Systems of Faith) and receive another Rule, another Lord, another and a carnal Hope; whereas the Unitarians agree with other Christians in all these and many other great Points.

As to your Rarity of the Address to the Morocco Embassador, I see not what it amounts to more

more the  
the Chr  
which t  
all Sides  
thing f  
from  
Names  
made b  
single  
clude f  
from f  
may re  
Matte  
were a  
Can  
that U  
a Chr  
the D  
best Ju  
rity  
they c  
tempo  
of the  
the C  
same  
bow'd  
Jesus  
ship t  
our g  
not  
as Ch  
if no  
q. d.  
with  
our F  
tend  
Sm c  
imita  
the f  
ship  
then  
claim  
cont  
A  
Page  
as y  
you  
of  
Cha  
fort  
zers  
said  
Per

more than a Complaint of the Corruption of the Christian Faith in the Article of one God, which the *Mahometans* have kept by Consent of all Sides. Yet for as much as I can learn nothing from any *Unitarians* of any such Address from 'em, nor do you produce any Subscribers Names, I conclude no such Address was ever made by any deputed from them, whatever any single Person might do: I suppose you conclude from the Matter of it, that it must be from some *Unitarian*, and perhaps so; yet you may remember, that so you concluded from the Matter of Dr. Tillotson's Sermons, that they were a *Socinian's*. Again,

Can you justify your Rashness in saying, that *Unitarians* are not *Christians*? when to be a Christian is to own the Authority and receive the Doctrine of Christ, according to their best Judgment (which one would think, a Charity as little as yours, might readily grant they do, who in their Belief go against all temporal Motives, and bear the heavy Wrath of their Persecutors.) Do they not worship the God of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*? the same God that the Apostles worship'd, who bow'd their Knees to the God and Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, Eph. 3. 14. Nay, don't they worship the same God that our Lord *Christ* himself, our great Pattern, worship'd? And are they not *Christians* in their Worship, who worship as *Christ* himself did? I pray who are *Christians*, if not these? Did he not say, *my God and yours*? q. d. You must have and own the same God with me; or, you and I have the same Object of our Faith and Joy, John 20. 17. Do you pretend to shew that ever *Jesus Christ* worship'd a *Son* or Holy Ghost? Shew it, and they will imitate him. In mean time, if having just the same God and Object of Supreme Worship as the Man *Christ Jesus* had, must make them not *Christians*, they envy not any who claim the name of the only *Christians*, upon the contrary Ground.

Again, Whether the *Unitarians* ever said, *Paganism* is preferable to the *Christian Doctrine*, as you assert in your Preface; and 'twill concern you to shew, that you make some Conscience of what you write, by making that heavy Charge good; if you can't do it, I shall henceforth have no great Opinion of such *Monopolizers* of Christianity: I know they may have said, that the Doctrine of the *Trinity of real Persons* or *Minds* in the Godhead, is like the

*Pagan Plurality of Gods*; and I think you have shown something like it, in producing the Testimony of *Heathens* to a *Trinity*. But as this is not *Paganism* in general, only in one Article; neither is this preferring *Paganism* to *Christianity* in this very one Point; nor is it to *Christianity*, but to what they deem corrupt Impositions, that they liken *Paganism* in this Point; and yet they count such *Trinitarians* to be *Christians*, because they have the same Rule of *Christ's Word*, with themselves: and tho they judg them very much mistaken in these Points, yet they think they may hold Inconsistencys, and hope the right part of the Inconsistency prevails in their Practice and Worship of one *Eternal He*, &c. if they act but sincerely, according to the best of their Understandings, and really believe what they profess.

And I must tell you, that the so grievous Charge of *Paganism* and *Tritheism* upon *Trinitarians*, is own'd and made good by other hands than the *Socinians*. Some *Trinitarians* themselves have ingenuously own'd, that 'tis *Paganism* which some Dignitaries of the Church have maintain'd under their Doctrine of a *Trinity of Persons* (Charge of *Tritheism* against Dr. *Sherlock*) and yet there are not a few of that same Opinion, tho neither *Dissenters*, nor the Church ever spew'd out any for this *Pagan Tritheism*; but the former have courted the Men of three infinite Minds, at the same time that they were violent against an *Unitarian*. So that *Pagan Tritheism* is not so strange a thing among them, who live and thrive either upon the Indulgence, or the Establishment, even in the Judgment of more wary *Trinitarians* themselves. And tho Dr. *Sherlock* thought they made Nonsense of their Creed, who did not hold the three infinite Minds; so that either they must be as much Pagans as he, or not *Trinitarians*: yet I shall not now examine that, only desire that *Socinians* alone may not be blam'd, for charging the *Trinity* of some with *Paganism*, and that it may not be taken worse at their Hands than at others.

This will lead me naturally to inquire next, what Force there is in your Reproach of the *Unitarians* with their Differences among themselves, and what reason you have to boast of the sweet Harmony of the *Trinitarians*. I know not one Sect of *Christians* who have not some Differences among themselves. The *Unitarians* are some of them *Arians*, and some *Socinians*, in their Judgment concerning *Jesus Christ*;



Christ; yet that hinders not their making the same Account of his present Dignity, whatever Beginning they attribute to him. All of them agree as unanimously in the Negative, *what he is not*, as Lutherans and Calvinists agree against Popery: and tho' they have spoken, I think confusedly, about Christ's Divine Worship; yet I am satisfy'd, Socinus himself, who was zealous for it, did not mean, that Supreme Worship was to be paid him as a distinct Person from the Father in him. See a late *Vindication of the Worship of Christ on Unitar. Princip.* But are not the Trinitarians in a much worse Case here? for surely a more notorious Untruth never dropt from your Pen, than what you conclude with, *That there are no Doctrines in which all Christian Churches are so much united as in the Trinity, Incarnation, and Satisfaction of Christ.* I am astonish'd at such Confidence! Are not all Christians as much agreed in the Doctrine of Christ's Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension, in the Doctrine of his coming to judge the World, and that of Eternal Life, as they are in the Trinity and Incarnation? From the time Men pretended to settle their Creeds in these Points; I say, from thenceforth they had nothing but Wars, and to this day the East remain divided from the West on the point of the personal Union. And the Nestorians (who are granted to be of the same Mind with the Socinians or Photinians, by so many Trinitarians; see the *Examination of the Bishop of Sarum's Exposition of the 2d Article*) are said to be more numerous than all the Protestant Churches. The Greek remains divided from the Western Church upon the point of the *third Person's* proceeding from Father and Son; and they are anathematized in the *Athanasian Creed*, in as much as they deny the Holy Spirit to proceed from the Son at all, by any *Eternal Procession*. See *Smith's State of the Greek Church*; and *Seller's Remarks on Athanasius*.

Among them of our *Two British established Churches*, how many sorts of Trinities have been observ'd? Let's see in one of them what sweet Harmony there is between Dr. S—b's, and Dr. Sherlock's Trinity. There are numerous Followers of both Schemes, and they own one another for Christians, so far forth, as little as any foreign Socinians will own some English Unitarians. Is this your Agreement, which you adore God's Providence for, when there is no Agreement, whether it be one God, or Three? or whether the three Persons be three infinite Minds (i. e. Gods) or three Modes? Each side

has own'd the Unitarians to be more in the right than the other: One side says the three Modes is Nonsense as well as Heresy; the other side says, they again are Pagan Tritheists, see *Preface to Life of Valent. Gentilis*. So that if one go to one Church, he'll join with a nonsensical Heretick, says one; if to another, he joins with a Pagan Tritheist, says the other. 'Tis not Words and Terms, but Sense and Conception that is a Man's Faith: so that unless there be the same Meaning as well as the same Terms, there is not the same Faith, tho' they all profess a Trinity of Words. Different Explications make so many different Creeds; and if the Trinity be reveal'd in Scripture so plainly, then I pray tell us which Trinity is so: for 'tis so plain it seems, that one Party says 'tis not the Tritheists Trinity of three Minds; and the other says, 'tis not their Trinity of three Modes, that the Scripture reveals; and the Unitarians are so complaisant as to take both their Words; and yet each side is angry that they will not come over to their Party. If it be a fundamental point, then one Party errs fundamentally, since they are so contrary to each other in their Sense, which you own is the Faith: so that there is no escaping Heresy at this rate. First, try to convert your Brethren in Terms, and then the Unitarians will not be distracted in their Choice what side to take. And in such a woful distracted Case (where no publick Decision cou'd be gain'd, tho' some have cry'd out for help till almost hoarse) were you over wise to set up such a vain boast of your Unity about the Trinity? If this be the Article in which Christians great Unity is to be boasted of, and the World call'd to behold and see their blessed Harmony herein, you did ill to tell it: but I know 'tis otherwise.

Then comes the Catholic Church in all Ages for your Opinion: this carries a brave Sound with it, and all Sides adorn their Discourses with this Flourish. It serves Papists and Protestants, Greek and Latin, Dr. So—b and Sher—k, and none more justly than the Deniers of the Son's eternal Personality, and his Equality to the Father, if you'll credit even their violent Adversary Mr. Jurieu (as far as concerns the most primitive Church Writers, or Antenicenes) who fully demonstrates, that they expressly deny'd those two great Points, till after Ages mended their Faith, *Lettr. Pastor. vol. 3. let. 6.* This great and common Boast of the Catholic Church,

Church  
ask'd  
that  
for th  
Ages  
chief  
they  
begu  
want  
Craft  
Opin  
tholic  
as m  
Papi  
Arian  
ches  
Wor  
none  
sure  
nasia  
Part  
tho  
tain  
Cath  
min  
I ha  
Chil  
thers  
Chur  
Chu  
Episc  
that  
the  
is,  
two  
the  
Cath  
Apos  
gene  
racy  
Whi  
are  
rati  
Here  
be o  
Peo  
In  
the  
ther  
the  
non  
to v  
whe



Church, tempts one to put the Question, once ask'd our Saviour, concerning the Woman that had seven Husbands, *Whose shall she be, for they all had her?* The Catholick Church in all Ages never agreed in any thing, if this be the chief Instance of their Agreement, I am sure they never agreed since these Controversys begun, the Violence and Art have not been wanting to make 'em unite. But here is the Craft on't, Men mean that those of their own Opinion only are Catholicks, and then all Catholicks be sure are of their Opinion: they have as narrow a Notion of Catholick Church as the Papists have. All the great Arian Councils, and Arian Writers, and numerous Nestorian Churches, and the Age when the whole Christian World was Arian, &c. must be thrown by as none of the Catholick Church; and then be sure the Catholick Church (*viz.* of the Athanasians) is against the Unitarians: as tho any Party can't make the like Sport with their Catholick Church; for I find 'tis a very uncertain thing, and that every side has their several Catholick Church when it comes to be examin'd. And how can it be otherwise? since I have seen with my own Eyes (says the admirable Chillingworth) Councils against Councils, some Fathers against others, nay against themselves, the Church and Consent of one Age against the Church of another. Just as if the Votarys of Episcopacy and Presbytery shou'd boast, the one, that the Church of Great Britain is Episcopall, the other that 'tis Presbyterian; when the Truth is, 'tis partly one partly t'other; one of the two Semi-national Churches being of one sort, the other of the other sort. I am enough Catholick if I agree but with Christ and his Apostles; they were Orthodox, but warn'd us of a general Apostacy, and Anti-Christian Degeneracy coming in apace, and like to last long. Which Side are of that Apostacy, and which are Catholicks, is to be try'd by the Scripture, rationally and consistently to be understood. Heresys must be, and 'tis not meant, that it shou'd be only among the fewest or undermost, as the People are made to believe.

In short, a Man may venture to talk big of the Catholick universal Church's Consent, but then it shou'd be only in the Pulpit (which is the safest place I know of to speak in, where none may contradict him) but you are too bold to venture it from the Press at this time a day, when the State of the Christian World is too

well understood, for Men to be cheated with Pretences to the Catholick Church of all Ages, on any one side.

You insinuate, that the Unitarians shou'd not be tolerated, and cry out, *Yet there is no Prosecution*, p. 40. when at the same time you know of an Instance of Severity towards him, whom you pretend to be their Preacher, tho with many false Circumstances. You say, *He was spew'd out even by the Presbyterians*: as if he were the worse Unitarian for what he has suffer'd for his Principle, *viz.* for denying that God Almighty had ever a Father, or was any one's Son; or as if it was such a Wonder to be spew'd out by the Presbyterians. Don't you think they have as weak a Stomach as others, and that they have as spewing Principles in their Catechism, of tolerating no false Religion? Would you like your *Jure Divino Episcopacy* ever the worse, if any had been so unmannerly as to tell you, that it had been spew'd out, even by the Presbyterians, in a Country you have heard of?

You say the Arian Persecutions witness, that the Unitarians would persecute when in their Power; I see you can prove the Unitarians are no upstart Self when you please, since you charge 'em with Crimes done 1300 years ago. I own the Arians were guilty of Unchristian Practices of this kind, even tho History should be thought to have aggravated Matters. But must none be tolerated whose Opinions have been receiv'd by some Persecutors? What will you then say for your Party? Besides, who was it taught the Arians to persecute? Whatever Athanasius pretends, 'tis certain, the First Severity w'd by Christians against one another, was in the banishing Arius and his Followers, says the Preface to Lactantius, *Lives of Persecut.* 'Twas by an Edict made Capital, so much as to keep an Arian Book; than which I know not of a more cruel Edict by Lewis the 14th. I know no Unitarian however but abhors that Unchristian Retaliation; for I truly think no better of a Christian Persecutor than I do of a Christian Thief, or Christian Murderer.

It is the inviolable unalienable Right of a reasonable Being to worship and profess, according to his Conscience, so long as nothing is done to the Injury of the Commonwealth in its proper Concernments. Have not the Unitarians a God and a Conscience, and an awful Eternity to be concern'd for? Would you have 'em abandon all publick Worship of God, or join



join in what they judge corrupt? Shall they thrust in upon those who reject 'em (like you) as no *Christians*, and solemnly pronounce them *everlastingly damn'd*? Must they be thrust out of the Churches, and yet not admitted to assemble themselves? Or shall they be provoked and arraigned of monstrous *Heresys*, and yet not have liberty to defend themselves? Is any thing more *mean* and piteous than for a Man to write against them with that licentious strain that you have done, and then to exclaim against suffering *their Books* to appear in their own Defence, as if you were conscious of your very great need of such a Refuge?

I'm sorry the Nakedness of Christians should

be thus expos'd; but as 'tis not possible to be hid, so if one side will run down the other, and allow 'em no quarter, but defame, and persecute, and damn, it must be expected they will retort Arguments in their own Defence. I wish indeed more healing Methods were taken, than by enlarging *Creeds*, and contracting *Charity*; but I shall never expect Good from any who have not an high Esteem for those two cardinal Vertues, *Sincerity* and *Moderation*.

Luke 6.22. *Blessed are ye when Men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their Company, and shall reprove you, and cast out your Name as evil, for the Son of Man's Sake. Rejoice in that Day, &c.*

F I N I S.







**P**

**Va**

**Wh**

**Ron**

bu  
i.  
un  
na  
ve  
Fo

**Prin**

m

THE  
*Previous* QUESTION

TO THE  
Several Questions

ABOUT  
Valid and Invalid BAPTISM,  
LAY-BAPTISM, &c.

CONSIDER'D,

VIZ

*Whether there be any Necessity (even upon the Principles of Mr. WALL's History of Infant-Baptism) for the continual Use of Baptism among the Posterity of Baptiz'd Christians?*

---

Rom. 11. 16. *If the Root be Holy, so are the Branches.*

---

*—It fully appears that Water-Baptism was never intended by God, but either only, or chiefly, for an Introductory or Planting Ordinance, i.e. to attend the Gospel for a time, at its first Reception by a People, until it should get some Rooting among 'em, not for a standing Ordinance in one and the same place; whereof good reason might be given, &c. says Mr. John Goodwin. Water-Dipping no Footing for Church-Communion, p. 30.*

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for S. Popping at the Black-Raven in Pater-  
noster-Row. M. DCC. XII. (Price 3 d.)



Several Questions

TO THE

ABOUT

Valid and Invalid Baptism

CONSIDERED



LONDON

Printed for J. Pardon at the Bath & in London  
MDCCLXII. (1762)

Quære, Whether Christian Baptism was intended by our Lord Jesus Christ, for such as descend from Christian Parents, and are born in the Church; or only for such as become Profelytes to Christianity from an Infidel State?

**I** AM sensible it will be look'd on as a great Presumption, to call into question a Practice that has so long and so generally obtain'd among Christian Churches, as has the Practice of baptizing the Posterity of Christians, whether in their Infant or Adult Estate; and upon which so many rest their Confidence, as on a most glorious Privilege, and mighty Means of their Salvation: But as I am one who admit no Plea of Prescription against Truth, so shall I judg it a sufficient Defence against all such popular and weak Arguments, if once it can be made appear, that *from the beginning it was not so practis'd, nor ordain'd.* And tho I do not positively assert, that according to the original Institution of *Jesus Christ*, none but such as came out of Infidelity were to be baptiz'd, yet I profess I very much question whether it were not so; and therefore desire a fair Solution of the Difficultys which I apprehend are not duly consider'd, by them who plead for the Baptism of such as are born of and educated under Christian Parents.

The great Ground of this my Doubt arises from that fundamental Proof of *Infant-Baptism*, taken from the Use of Baptism among the *Jews*, by which Profelytes were wont to be initiated, as 'tis set forth in *Mr. Wall's History of Baptism* (which has put me upon this Essay) and many others before him.

'Tis well argu'd by the Learned *Pedobaptists*, that our Saviour's Command to baptize, being general, must in all reason be suppos'd to mean, that it should be done according to the known common Practice of Baptism (if there were any such Practice) which his Disciples well understood, and had been acquainted with. Otherwise it had been most necessary for our Lord Jesus to have made such exceptions from the general Method of Practice, and such new Rules as his Disciples were to observe, and



TO THE  
Several Questions

ABOUT

Valid and Invalid Baptism

CONSIDERED



Printed for J. Parker at the Angel in Pall Mall  
(1744)

I  
so m  
and  
adm  
a fu  
men  
was  
fert,  
none  
I pro  
ther  
preh  
Bap  
Pare  
T  
men  
amon  
as'ti  
upon  
'T  
Com  
pos  
com  
whic  
with  
to h  
tice,

Quære, Whether Christian Baptism was intended by our Lord Jesus Christ, for such as descend from Christian Parents, and are born in the Church; or only for such as become Profelytes to Christianity from an Infidel State?

I AM sensible it will be look'd on as a great Presumption, to call into question a Practice that has so long and so generally obtain'd among Christian Churches, as has the Practice of baptizing the Posterity of Christians, whether in their Infant or Adult Estate; and upon which so many rest their Confidence, as on a most glorious Privilege, and mighty Means of their Salvation: But as I am one who admit no Plea of Prescription against Truth, so shall I judg it a sufficient Defence against all such popular and weak Arguments, if once it can be made appear, that *from the beginning it was not so practis'd, nor ordain'd.* And tho I do not positively assert, that according to the original Institution of *Jesus Christ*, none but such as came out of Infidelity were to be baptiz'd, yet I profess I very much question whether it were not so; and therefore desire a fair Solution of the Difficultys which I apprehend are not duly consider'd, by them who plead for the Baptism of such as are born of and educated under Christian Parents.

The great Ground of this my Doubt arises from that fundamental Proof of *Infant-Baptism*, taken from the Use of Baptism among the *Jews*, by which Profelytes were wont to be initiated, as 'tis set forth in *Mr. Wall's History of Baptism* (which has put me upon this Essay) and many others before him.

'Tis well argu'd by the Learned *Pedobaptists*, that our Saviour's Command to baptize, being general, must in all reason be suppos'd to mean, that it should be done according to the known common Practice of Baptism (if there were any such Practice) which his Disciples well understood, and had been acquainted with. Otherwise it had been most necessary for our Lord Jesus to have made such exceptions from the general Method of Practice, and such new Rules as his Disciples were to observe, and



which they could not learn without some farther Direction, than his general Command to *go and baptize*. For our Saviour only bids them *Go and baptize all Nations*, &c. *Mat. 28. 19.* he adds not one word of Limitation or special Direction about the *Subjects* of Baptism. So that if the *Jews* had been accustom'd (as Mr. Wall asserts, and with very probable reason too) to disciple Infidels, whether Infants or Adult, by baptizing them into their Communion; there is no just doubt to be made, but that our Lord, speaking among *Jews*, and bidding them, *Go and disciple all Nations, baptizing them*; did leave 'em to understand it of their practising it under the like Rules, and upon the like Subjects, as was usual among the *Jews* already. 'Twas indeed to be a Baptism into another Religion, and to be extended to all Nations; but no other Exception was made from the known Rules of Baptism: and therefore Mr. Wall, in his *Introduction*, has upon this very Principle built his Argument, and very strongly infers, that Infants are the due Subjects of *Christian* Baptism, because they were so of the *Jewish*.

Nor can I see any room left for a modest and ingenuous Denial of the Inference, supposing the Premises to be true, *viz.* That Baptism of Proselytes and their Infant-Children was an usual and known Practice among the *Jews* in our Saviour's Days on earth. I must confess I cannot see any Argument for Infant-Baptism so forcible as this, taken from the Practice of baptizing *Jewish Proselytes*; nor does Mr. Wall seem to me, to rely on any other, without this. How Mr. Wall can reconcile Infant-Baptism to the Method and Office for Baptism, prescrib'd by the Church of *England*, is another question; by which the Child is suppos'd to be a Believer, and by its Suretys does profess, *I believe, and I desire to be baptiz'd*; which an Infant not grown up to Understanding will not easily be suppos'd capable of, so that it seems tacitly to be intended only for actual Believers: and by this one Concession, great Advantage is afforded, and some think the Cause is in effect given up to the *Antipadobaptists*, who plead only for Believers Baptism. But this is only an Argument *ad hominem*, or against the Church, and weakens not the Cause of Infant-Baptism in general, which is so well establish'd upon his main *Topick*, *viz.* the antient *Jewish* Practice of baptizing Infant-Proselytes; and which I suppose Mr. Wall is more concern'd to defend, than the Office of a particular Church, tho ever so well constituted.

I know the *Antipadobaptists* do not admit the Evidence to this Practice of *Jewish Baptism* in our Saviour's time; but I think impartially, that Mr. Wall, after others, has made it highly probable at least, from very many Testimonys of the *Jewish* Writers, who, I think without any one dissenting Voice, allow the Fact. And tho the Testimonys be from *Jews* since Christ's time (we not having any of their more antient Writings, except the Sacred)

Sacred) yet since they who best knew their own Traditions that were current among them, and especially of a visible open matter of Fact, as this of Baptism was, and from whom only one can hope to understand their own History of Facts, not recorded expressly in Scripture; since they, I say, do unanimously agree in this matter of Fact, I take it to be a Testimony of very great force, and not to be slighted by such as cannot say half a quarter so much, indeed can say nothing at all, for proof of the Negative. The Pretence of *Rabbi Eliezar's* denying any such Custom among the *Jews*, taken from *Sir Norton Knatchbul*, is sufficiently expos'd at the end of *Mr. Wall's* Introduction; being indeed no Denial of such a Practice at all.

And indeed besides the mention of a *Jewish Baptism*, by some of the antient Christian Writers, to which they oppose the Christian Baptism; 'tis hard to be deny'd, that there is a broad Intimation, even in the Gospel it self, of such a known Practice among the *Jews* in *John the Baptist's* time, in that question of the *Pharisees*, *John 1. 25. Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not the Christ, nor Elias, nor a Prophet?* They wonder'd not at proselyting by Baptism; for they ask'd not, What meanest thou by this Action? as they had probably done, had it been a novel and strange Ceremony; but only they demand by what Authority he thus made Proselytes, *i. e.* among the *Jews*, who were already of the true Church and Faith, and therefore without some new Dispensation (for establishing whereof there needed at least some great Prophet) he could have no Authority to baptize or proselyte among the *Jews*. They speak as if they knew such Baptism to be of that great importance, that none but one authoriz'd to introduce a new State of Religion, might authorize this Practice of it. How come they to esteem it of so much more signification than other Ceremonys, which they scrupled not to admit upon less Authority than of a great Prophet? I suppose 'twas because they had been accustom'd to such a solemn Use of it, as that of proselyting Persons to the true Religion.

I own this is not expressly nor demonstratively to be shewn from the Text; but I see no Sense of it so fair and natural as this. And therefore taking this only for a strong Presumption, added to the former Testimonys, for the antient Practice of Baptism among the *Jews*, I think that all taken together, ties the Argument so hard, that the *Antipadobaptists* cannot solve it, nor offer half so many Probabilitys either from Reason or Testimonys, against this *Matter of Fact*, as are brought for it; I mean for the Use of baptizing Proselytes into the *Jewish* Religion: since they can neither find one antient *Jewish* Writer who denies this Custom, whilst so many affirm it, nor one of them who own the Use of Proselyte-Baptism at all, that ever denies it to have extended to *Infants*, as well as to others.

**Especially**



Especially are these Testimonys of the *Jewish* Writers of greater weight, because this very Practise which they report to have been of so antient a date, did still remain among 'em: for I must confess, that if it had not been of that Antiquity which it pretends to, *viz.* before Christ's time; I cannot suppose it would ever have become a Custom among the *Jews* afterward. Would they begin to proselyte Persons to their Religion by Baptism in imitation of the Disciples of *Jesus of Nazareth*, whom they held accursed? They would never so far own him, as to bring in a new Institution in conformity to his Command; which Innovation among them could not but be taken great notice of, and 'tis likely would have been observ'd and remark'd by some Writer, Jewish or Christian. 'Tis of no force to say, that the latter *Jews* might pretend Baptism to have been an old Practise among their Nation, on purpose that the Christian Religion might be thought to borrow from theirs; since this was never deny'd by the Christian Church. We know that Christians are but *engrafted into their Olive-Tree*, of which they were the natural Branches; and that we are built on the *Foundation of their Prophets*, Rom. 11. Eph. 2. 20. that Christ instituted his Supper after the manner of the *Post-cœnium*, at the Paschal Supper of the *Jews*, and borrow'd many Customs from that Church. Christians suffer nothing by owning this, nor was there any Contention about it to prompt the *Jews* to forge an Evidence in the Case. So that if this *Proselyte-Baptism* were taken up by them since Christ's time, it must have been a mere Innovation in imitation of Christians; which whether that be most likely, I leave any one to judg. For my own part, I am much more ready to believe their own Testimonys to the Antiquity of that Practise, as being antecedent to Christ's Institution of Baptism, as their Paschal *Post-cœnium* was to his other Institution of the *Lord's Supper*.

But then, if these Premises be true, and the Inference for *Pædobaptism* be just, both which Mr. Wall strenuously maintaine; I cannot see but another Inference will be equally just, tho not so grateful to Mr. Wall, *viz.* That then none of the Posterity of Christians descended from baptiz'd Parents or Ancestors, in a continu'd Christian Line, not interrupted by open Apostacy from Christianity, are bound by Christ's Institution to be baptiz'd. And so both *Pædo*-and *Antipædobaptists* will be in great measure silenc'd at one blow.

To make this appear, we must consider that Mr. Wall's and the *Pædobaptists* Argument hence for Infant-Baptism, has no force but upon this ground alone, *viz.* that our Lord Jesus giving his Command to baptize in general, without any *Caveat* or Limitation, did leave his Apostles to apply Baptism to all the same Subjects as the *Jews* were wont to do; and therefore to Infants as well as to others. And it will be said, that for the same reason the Christian Baptism was to have no other Subjects than

than  
of th  
Wall  
thei  
bapt  
fore  
betur  
as on  
Pare  
tail  
So  
the l  
more  
*viz.*  
form  
the U  
it lea  
befor  
to ad  
Chur  
N  
seem  
Mat.  
baptiz  
ing C  
wher  
more  
that  
*Jews*  
Chri  
tian  
be th  
were  
tom  
for th  
So  
amon  
come  
plead  
own  
never  
up hi  
taken  
the A  
the k  
by it  
his P  
Rule

than the *Jewish* Baptism had, which was never apply'd to any of the Offspring of Believers, born in the Church. For Mr. Wall has fully prov'd, by the same Authority which evidences their Custom to baptize *Infant-Profelytes*, that the *Jews* never did baptize any that were born of Parents who were profelyted before; and that 'twas a Maxim among them, *Filius baptizati habetur pro baptizato*; i. e. The Child born of one baptiz'd, is accounted as one baptiz'd himself. It seems that the one Sanctification of the Parents was to them and their Issue, unless they cut off the Entail by their Apostacy to Infidelity.

So that if our Lord left his Disciples to practise according to the known establish'd Rules of the *Jews*, it follows that he no more allow'd 'em hereby to add any new Subjects of Baptism, viz. such as the Offspring of Believers, than to bar any of the former allow'd Subjects of it; i. e. the *Infant-Profelytes* born in the Uncleaness of Infidelity. If Mr. Wall's Argument be good, it leaves the Case, as to the Subjects of Baptism, just as it was before: since there is no more warrant from Christ's Institution to add, than to diminish; or to baptize born Members of the Church, than to cut off the Infants of new Profelytes.

Nay, if we consider well Christ's Commission to baptize, it seems directly to respect only the Profelytes from Infidelity: *Mat. 28. 19. Go disciple (i. e. profelyte, says Mr. Wall) all Nations, baptizing them.* 'Twas upon their going to convert the unbelieving Gentiles, that they were empower'd to baptize 'em; so that where there is no more profelyting, there may seem to be no more baptizing intended. And as none, I think, can pretend that the *Jews by Nature* were accounted Profelytes among the *Jews*; so neither can such as are born and educated in the Christian Church, and of Christian Parents, be counted Christian Profelytes. How then come the Posterity of Profelytes to be the Subjects of Baptism now, among us Christians, if they were not so among the *Jews*; when at the same time the Custom and Practice of the *Jews* is own'd to be the Rule of Christ for the Practice of Baptism among Christians?

So that Mr. Wall must either allow, that Baptism may cease among Christian Churches where no Converts from Infidelity come in, and so yield the Cause to the *Socinians*; or if he still plead for the baptizing the Offspring of Christians, he must own that he goes quite off from his own Principles, and can never justify it by the *Jewish* Practice of Baptism; and so gives up his fundamental Argument for Infant-Baptism, after he had taken pains to establish it. And to what purpose does he call the *Antipaedobaptists* to observe Christ's Institution, interpreted by the known *Jewish* Practice, when he himself is no more guided by it than they? 'Twill be expected that he either reconcile his Practice of baptizing Christians holy Posterity, to the *Jewish* Rule of not baptizing the Children born of Profelytes; or that he



he renounce his Opinion, viz. That Christ's Command is to be practis'd according to their known Rule, when he says, *Go and baptize*. And if he do this, he will have a hard task to answer his own Arguments to the contrary.

The Sum of what I justly gather from Mr. Wall's Argument is this; Jesus Christ has requir'd his Disciples to proselyte and baptize the Nations: Now 'tis known how the Jews must needs understand such a Precept, viz. according to their own Usage, which was to baptize Proselytes and their Children born in Infidelity, but not any descended from them: And therefore let us go and do likewise.

And this seems to be built on good Reason, from the Nature and Design of Baptism; which seems not to be intended for the washing away the Pollutions contracted in a State of Christianity, for then 'twere useful to repeat it often upon Christians; but only the Uncleaness of Infidelity, when Men were *Aliens* to the Christian Church. They who came of a polluted abominable Stock, and Enemys to the Church of God, had reason to be symbolically purify'd by Baptism, because they were held for profane and unclean, till naturaliz'd and engrafted into the Holy Church. But being thus naturaliz'd, it seems to be for them and their Posterity all at once. Their Descendants are a holy Race of course; for says the Apostle, *If the Root be holy, the Branches are also holy*, Rom. 11. 16. there needs no new engrafting of the natural Branches. Washing is not appointed for the Pure and Clean, but for the Unclean: Now the Text says expressly, that the Children of Christian Parents are *not unclean*, but they are *holy*, or pure; i. e. by being come of cleansed holy Parents, 1 Cor. 7. 14. It seems they are accounted as already baptiz'd, or cleansed in their Parents Baptism; just agreeable to the Jewish Maxim abovesaid. 'Tis a strange Inference of some, that Children must be baptiz'd because they are said to be holy or clean, when the End of Baptism is to cleanse and make holy; and if the Apostle says, they have that effect already by being of Christian Parents, what need of Baptism can be prov'd, where the Person is already politically and relatively holy, and has all the real Cleansing and Holiness, that is to be suppos'd to be wrought by such external Rites of Purification?

As I take the *Antipadobaptists* Interpretation of that last mention'd Text to be too forc'd, who think by *being holy* is meant *being legitimate*; whereas none are ever said in Scripture to be *ἀγιοι*, *Saints* or *Holy*, merely for being not Bastards: so I judge Mr. Wall's Sense to be no less violent, and as like a shift to serve a turn as the other. He understands it of a Holiness by being baptiz'd, as if the Apostle had said, *Else were your Children unbaptiz'd, but now they are sanctify'd by Baptism*. But how can this be a Consequence of the foregoing part of the Text? *The unbelieving*

*Unbelieving Wife* has been sanctify'd (i. e. has been baptiz'd, as Mr. Wall expounds it) by the Husband, else were your Children unclean, (i. e. would be kept unbaptiz'd) but now are they holy, or Saints; i. e. they are generally baptiz'd, and so become holy. See his *History of Inf. Bapt.* p. 68. I say 'tis no just Consequence which he makes the Apostle to draw; nor would it follow, that if the Husband do not prevail upon the unbelieving Wife to be converted and baptiz'd, that then the Children would be unbaptiz'd; because tho' only the Father were a Believer, the Child might be brought to Baptism, if nothing else hinder: and so in this sense the Children would not be unclean, tho' the unbelieving Wife were never baptiz'd. So that this is not to be taken for the Apostle's Meaning.

And therefore Mr. Lock's Paraphrase, which Mr. Wall calls absurd, without shewing why, may yet stand; viz. that by being holy, is meant that such Children are not in the state of Heathens, but born Members of the Christian Church; not profane Aliens, but pure and natural Branches of the Commonwealth of the Christian Israel. Which seems to be all the Holiness which *Jerom* judg'd 'em capable of, when speaking of this Argument, and allowing a relative Holiness, such as belong'd to the Vessels of the Tabernacle, he adds, that nothing can be properly holy, but what has sense, and fears God. 'Tis not then want of Baptism, but want of Sense and Capacity, that hinders their being real Saints; and relatively they are such, antecedently to any Baptism. Nay, they are really Saints in design, or to use *Tertullian's* words, *Sanctitati designati*, design'd for real Holiness: by the Advantage of their Birth, and in the Intention of their Parents, and the Prospect of a Christian Education, they are the Expectants or the hopeful Candidates of real Piety, whether baptiz'd a-new or not, as far as yet appears.

It still strengthens the Presumption on this side, that in all the History of the Apostles and Churches in the *Acts of the Apostles*, we find not one Instance of the baptizing of any, that were born of Christian Parents, either Infants or Adult. The *Antipadobaptists* demand an Instance of any Infant being baptiz'd, and the *Padobaptists* ask for an Instance of any Adult Person's Baptism, who had been born of Christian Parents: but neither Side can produce any Evidence; no, not in all that first History of the Churches, running thro' a Series of near thirty Years, in which time multitudes, no doubt, were born of Christian Parents, and grown up to Maturity and Manhood; and yet not one of 'em is mention'd to be baptiz'd; tho' of many Profelytes 'tis often observ'd. So that it looks at best doubtful, whether any born Christians, or the Seed of Profelytes were baptiz'd, any more than the Seed of the Jewish Profelytes were. Nay, since the baptizing the holy Seed of Profelytes was beyond the known Rule and Custom of the Jews, in their Use of Baptism; 'twas



the more necessary to have been taken notice of in that *History of the Acts*, if the Apostles so practis'd: because it does not at all appear in Christ's Institution, that he intended such a Variation from the common Rules of the known *Jewish* Practice, and therefore it requir'd to be made plain by the History of the Apostles After-Practice. For if neither the original Institution of Christ, nor the After-Practice of the Apostles, do warrant this considerable Alteration in the Practice of Baptism, I cannot see how it should be known, or from whence Christians should be able to infer it to be a Duty.

So that upon the whole matter it must be own'd, that Mr. Wall, from the Custom and Practice of the *Jews*, has indeed urg'd a very strong Argument against the *Antipadobaptists*, and shews well, that Infants along with their proselyted Parents are to be enter'd into the Christian Society by Baptism. But then 'tis just as strong an Argument against himself, and all those who are for continuing Baptism among the Posterity of Christians. His Argument establishes Infant-Baptism; but then 'tis of no Infants, nor others, but who were born in Infidelity, or of Parents not Christian.

And therefore whatever weight he supposes our Lord to have laid upon Baptism in that Text, *John 3. 5.* it can only relate to such as are converted from Infidelity: Nor could *Nicodemus*, as a Master in *Israel*, be suppos'd to have understood him otherwise; since with the *Jews*, only such were Subjects of Baptism.

And now when there is so much appearance of force in this Argument, against the Necessity of repeating Baptism to the Posterity of Christians, that an honest Mind may well be suppos'd to be convinc'd and determin'd by it; one would wonder what occasion Mr. Wall had (in his *Introduction*, p. 54.) for that poor, invidious, and, I believe, false Suggestion: 'Tis easy, says he, to guess what sway'd Socinus into the other Opinion, viz. his Desire of abolishing the Doctrine of the Trinity; which 'twas hard to accomplish, so long as Persons were continually baptiz'd into that Faith: As if Socinus was against that Trinity, which he judg'd the Christian Baptism to relate to; or would have that Doctrine abolish'd, which he understood Baptism to countenance. For 'tis certain he never imagin'd, that Baptism into the Name of one, to whom *all Power was given*, could be a reasonable Proof of that Person's Supreme Deity. So that 'tis much more likely he was sway'd by the pure Force of the Argument here insisted on, without the need of any other Prejudice. But 'tis hard to guess what sway'd Mr. Wall to such a mean Suggestion; whether his great Prejudice, so oft vented against the *Socinians*, or his Willingness to make his Reader slip over the true reason of Socinus's being of that Opinion. For it is a pretty crafty way of some Writers, when they find their Adversarys produce a strong Argument to support their Opinion; instead of answering it

it fairly, they fall a guessing what else may bias them, and insinuate some slender or odious secret reason, when they have given an open and more likely reason for themselves; which their Opposers find so troublesome, that they had much rather start some new imaginary Reasons for them, which they think they can better deal with. But Mr. Wall will be above this Method, who has observ'd (which on this occasion comes to mind) that a *great Stock of Learning does not always cure that narrowness of Soul, by which some are inclin'd to do any mean and foul thing to favour a Side, or set up a Party*, pag. 61. which is the heavy load he lays so unmercifully upon the illustrious Grotius, upon no sufficient occasion, I judg, if the Matter alledg'd were truly stated and consider'd.

I know not how early Instances Mr. Wall or any other can give of the Baptism of Children; or the Antipædobaptists of the Baptism of any adult Persons, that were born in Christianity. He has shewn that all the antient Instances which the Antipædobaptists bring of adult Persons being baptiz'd, are of Persons most probably born of unprofelyted or Infidel Parents; and that there is but one Instance (and this very obscure and modern) to the contrary, viz. in *Greg. Nazianzen*, see *Hist.* p. 285. which is too late to be valu'd in an Inquiry after the Original Practice of Christians, being so late as the *fourth Century*. Now if Mr. Wall, on the other hand, cannot find any Instances of Children of baptiz'd Parents, who were baptiz'd in their Infancy, in early Antiquity (as I think he has not pretended to do for the *Two first Centuries*) I think it follows hence, that there are no Instances to be found either on one side or on the other; i. e. neither of the Baptism of any Adult, nor of any Infants descended from baptiz'd Parents; which is a great Presumption that no such were baptiz'd; However others, both Infants and Adult, might be so, viz. among new Converts from Infidelity.

Even *Tertullian* himself, tho a Man of no great Esteem by Mr. Wall's Account, seems to me to make a difference between the Issue of *Christians* and of *Pagans*, as to the needfulness of Baptism; he says (in Mr. Wall's Citation, *Hist.* p. 22.) *That no Birth, almost of the Heathens, is pure or clean, but that the Apostle has said, the Offspring, of either Parent sanctify'd, are holy: willing to be understood that they are design'd for Holiness, and by this to Salvation; otherwise (i. e. in any other Case, viz. of an unclean Birth) he would have minded 'em of the Lord's Decree, Except one be born of Water, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God; that is, he shall not be holy.* It seems Christ's Rule for Baptism was not judg'd by him to extend to other than Heathens profelyted, who had that Uncleaness to be wash'd away, which the Christians Offspring had not.

And for the Fancy, that by the *designatos sanctitati* is intended, that they were design'd for Baptism, I see no ground for it at



all; but rather that they were design'd for Holiness, without any particular *Baptism*: whereas, in others, he supposes Holiness to be the Consequence of it by Christ's Decree.

However, be his meaning what it will, as I build not on it, so I scarce think Mr. Wall will judg of the Primitive Practice by *Tertullian's* Judgment or Advice, which is not very favourable for early Infant-Baptism, or for appropriating the Act to the Clergy; especially in a Business wherein he writes with such Uncertainty and Inconsistency, and was certainly in the wrong, either in allowing the Baptism of Infants, or in pleading for the delay of Baptism to riper Years, by such Arguments as he uses: so that he seems not to know fully what the Practice of the Church, or the Duty of Christians was in that Affair; or perhaps the Practice was not settled then, but wavering and various.

The plainest and fullest Evidence in Antiquity which Mr. Wall brings for baptizing the Children, even of Christian Parents, is in *St. Cyprian's* time; but then there is as plain Testimony from that Author *de Lapsis*, that it was customary to give the Eucharist also to Infants: And if this was an Innovation and an Error in the Administration of the one Sacrament, 'tis no wonder if there should be an Error as to the Application of the other also. Superstition begun to spread apace; and who knows which began first, whether the communicating the Infants of Christian Parents, or the baptizing them? So that unless more early Instances can be given of baptizing the Offspring of proselyted Parents, than of communicating Infants (which *Austin* judg'd so antient as to account it an Apostolical Tradition) I don't see any better Authority from Antiquity for the one than for the other; and both may seem to stand on the same ground. The antient Practice will then give us no more true Light into the Apostolical Practice, as to Baptism, than it will do as to the Apostolical Practice in the Eucharist; if the one was corrupted, why not the other? Both might possibly be apply'd beyond their due bounds, and extended to wrong Subjects: when once Men plac'd more Virtue in these Rituals, than was meet, no wonder if they were fond of applying 'em to more than was at first intended.

I know Mr. Wall takes some notice of the Advantage, which from his Argument redounds to *Socinus's* Opinion, viz. of the no-necessity of continuing Baptism to Christian Posterity; and seems to enter some *Caveats* against the Consequence I am drawing from his way of proving Infant-Baptism: but he is far from obviating or overthrowing this Consequence by any thing that he has suggested. He endeavours to guard himself, by telling us,

*Object. 1.* That there never was any Age (at least since Abraham) in which the Children that were admitted into Covenant, whether of

Jews

*Jews or Proselytes, had not some Badg of such their Admission.* Introd. p. 55. To this I answer, 1. If it was so before *Abraham*, this is enough to shew that 'tis not necessary always to be otherwise. Many things were us'd all along in the Church from *Abraham's* time, that are laid aside under the Gospel; and indeed the time since *Abraham* amounts to no more than just the *Jewish* Dispensation that began in *Abraham*, and was more compleatly establish'd under *Moses*.

2. No such Badg of such Admission was ever in any Age necessary, without a Divine Command; and therefore if there be no Command for such Admission by Badg, there is no such reason for it as of old. But,

3. The matter of Fact asserted by *Mr. Wall* is not true; for even since *Abraham's* time, yea and ever since that time, the Female Children of natural *Jews* and *Proselytes* were admitted into the *Jewish* Church, by virtue of their Descent and Birth, without any new Badg requir'd in order to their Admission; for that these Females were wont to be admitted by Sacrifice ever since *Abraham's* time, nay, since *Moses's* time, *Mr. Wall* has confidently asserted, but cannot prove; nay, that in any Age it was necessary for them to be admitted by that Ceremony, he cannot shew; nor did God ever require any such thing. If the *Jews* had lately introduc'd such a Custom (which yet he has not made appear) 'tis not to be quoted for a *Precedent*, or as an Instance of the Divine Method with his Church, when 'twas only an arbitrary human Injunction at most. So I turn *Mr. Wall's* Argument against him, and say, That if there never was any Age in which God did not admit divers Persons into Covenant, or into his Church, without any visible Badg of that Admission in their own Persons, then it will not be unsuitable to his former Methods, if he so admit some under the Gospel-Dispensation.

*Obj. 2.* He says, *The Male Children of Jews and Proselytes were admitted by Circumcision.*

*Ans.* 1. I allow it; but then it was because this was particularly requir'd of them by God, and probably for some other reason (proper to their Constitution) than admitting 'em into the Church; since the Females were admitted without it. Let such a Divine Ordinance be produc'd for baptizing the Offspring of Christians, and it shall suffice with me, else there is no Consequence in it. To say, that because the *Jews* circumcis'd the Children of circumcis'd Parents at God's Command, therefore we must baptize the Children of baptiz'd Parents, the contrary to what was practis'd by the *Jews*, is quite besides the meaning of *Christ's* Command. For, 2. I add, That the *Jews* Practice of Circumcision, is not the *Christians* Direction for the Practice of Baptism; because our Lord *Jesus* did not bid his Disciples to baptize as they were wont to circumcise among the *Jews*, but to baptize as they were wont to baptize, as *Mr. Wall*

owns.



owns. Therefore 'tis no matter how Circumcision was apply'd, but the Question is how Baptism was so; and if Baptism was wont to be practis'd in a different Method, and on different Subjects from what Circumcision was, then 'tis plain our Christian Baptism, which Christ requires to be regulated by the Jewish Baptism, ought to be conform'd to the known Rules of Baptism, and not to them of Circumcision.

Nor can any pretend to urge *Parity of Reason* in the Case, because it cannot be made appear that such Circumcision of the Infants of Jews was not *either* a mere arbitrary Injunction of God, or else founded upon some particular reason, proper to the State of that People, who were to be kept separate from all other Nations. In the latter Case there will be no *Parity of Reason*, and in the former no reason at all from the nature of the thing, being God's Sovereign Pleasure, which is at liberty to vary. And as to the Nature or intrinsic Goodness of the thing, there seem'd no Excellency at all in such a Badg, as *Justin Martyr* well observes of Circumcision; *In signum, datam circumcissionem, non tanquam opus justitia, quidquid enim ad justitiam virtutemque pertinet, etiam faminis Deus dedit, ut ex aquo servare possint.* Dial. cum Tryph.

But adds *Mr. Wall*, *St. Paul* says, Baptism serves instead of Circumcision, calling it the Circumcision of Christ, Col. 2. 11, 12. But what then? I hope it does not follow that the Subjects of Baptism must be just the same as of Circumcision, because there may be some common use of both. They that were baptiz'd into Christ, as the *Colossian* Profelytes had been, were spiritually circumcis'd, and mortify'd to Sin, as much as the Jews who were circumcis'd with hand: but this does not argue that all Christians must be baptiz'd, since as the one half of the Jews Posterity were capable of this inward spiritual Circumcision, without the external Circumcision, and were in a sort held for circumcis'd or clean, by virtue of their Descent from circumcis'd Parents; even so may the Posterity of Christians have this spiritual Circumcision, without any other Baptism than that of their Christian Parents, which in a sort may be held to be virtually the baptizing of their whole Race and Offspring. This intirely depends on the Will of the Lawgiver, which *Mr. Wall* has not made appear to be, that the Seed of Christian Profelytes should be baptiz'd, any more than the Seed of Jewish Profelytes were so.

If it be said Baptism is necessary, even for such as are born in Christianity, to engage them more solemnly to dedicate themselves to God personally, and so give them a quicker sense of their Duty and Obligation, than they can be conceiv'd to have by such a general relation to God and Christ, as rises from their being come of Christian Parents.

I a  
tism,  
ble to  
tism  
the f  
gume  
as mu  
for re  
to Go  
Bapti  
2.  
tism,  
for h  
of w  
which  
3.  
Duty  
ligion  
Suppe  
Pe  
imme  
can t  
be ne  
1.  
nor  
Supp  
tism,  
or ve  
thing  
to n  
Chri  
2.  
shou  
ther  
and  
to C  
need  
I wo  
Com  
no  
visio  
have  
lys  
Dang  
wha  
ter f  
way  
judg

I answer, 1. That if we must be directed in the use of Baptism, by the Advantages we imagine it may be made serviceable to, then it seems as necessary that we often repeat our Baptism, to revive our Obligation, after many years are past, and the fresh sense of that Solemnity is worn off. So that this Argument (unless the Divine Command makes a Difference) has as much force in it, for often renewing Baptism on others, as for renewing it upon Children, who have been already engag'd to God; and in some sort have been baptiz'd in their Parents Baptism, and are born in Covenant with him.

2. I judg one may have as lively a sense of his Ancestors Baptism, and their Engagement for themselves and their Issue, as for his own personal Baptism in the Incapacity of his Infancy, of which he has no more remembrance than of the other, which is to him the same thing.

3. There are other sufficient ways to revive the sense of our Duty to God, and of our religious Bonds, viz. by the other religious Dutys of our Profession, and in particular by the *Lord's Supper*.

Perhaps some may say, Suppose it be not certain that any but immediate *Converts* are requir'd to be baptiz'd; yet what harm can there be in renewing it to their Posterity, tho it may not be necessary?

1. I say, as to the harm of doing it, there will be no more nor less harm in baptizing the Children of Christians, on a Supposition that they be already sanctify'd in their Parents Baptism, than there is in rebaptizing Persons once duly baptiz'd, or *reordaining* Ministers once duly ordain'd; 'tis only doing a thing with great Solemnity in God's Name that is needless, and to no purpose, unless something else can make it needful besides Christ's Institution.

2. If it be not necessary to be done, then I add, that tho there should be no great harm in doing a thing not necessary, yet there may be great harm in not leaving others to their liberty, and in urging the necessity of such personal Baptism, in order to Church-Communion, if it be not commanded by Christ. All needless Occasions of Contention are hurtful; and therefore tho I would not measure my Duty to God, nor interpret his holy Command, merely in accommodation to any outward Interest, no not that of external Quiet and Rest from contentious Divisions, at the expence of Truth (since our Lord himself will have Truth profess'd, tho it prove an occasion of setting Families at variance, *Brother against Brother, the Mother against the Daughter, and the Daughter against the Mother*, Mat. 10. 35.) yet if what I advance be consistent with Truth, I shall think it the better for having a good tendency to promote Peace, and taking away many occasions of unhappy Strife among Christians, as I judg it will. For

This



This will ease us of many bitter Controversys about *Baptism*, as whether by Immersion or Effusion? Whether Infants or Adult Persons are to be baptiz'd in a Christian Church? Whether by Bishop or Presbyter? Since we are all generally descended from some or other Ancestors, that no doubt have been regularly baptiz'd: Nay this may probably prove Quakers to be of the Christian Church still, tho not baptiz'd themselves, while they are the Seed of baptiz'd Parents, and still own Christianity, as they understand it. Nay this may give great ease to the Clergy, and particularly to Mr. Wall, who, p. 154. is very much against the Doctrine which involves the Baptizer in endless Scruples, which Infants he may baptize, and which not: and therefore is for Baptism of all Children, the Owners of which desire Baptism for them, p. 381. But tho this be a compendious way of ending Scruples as to the Subjects of Baptism, yet even still there are many Scruples will meet him again at another turn on his Principles. For

If every Christian must have a particular Baptism duly administered to himself, and may not be admitted to the Eucharist without such Baptism, then 'tis incumbent on the Administrator or Presbyter to examine into the validity of the Baptism of every Communicant: As whether he ever was baptiz'd, or not? By whom? Whether by a Catholick, or a Schismatick, or Heretick? Whether by a Tritheist, or a Socinian? Whether by one ordain'd aright, or an Intruder? I confess I don't think these Matters are inquir'd into, in order to Communion either with the Church or Dissenters, except in some Points by the Antipædobaptists, who usually place their main Zeal in this Article; yet I must think these are needful Questions concerning a Communicant, if a true authentick Baptism be necessary to Christian-Communion, and to Salvation among Christians.

It would be hard to question Mr. Wall's great care in these matters, especially now there are, as he owns, so many Socinians in the Church, and out of it; against whom he has eas'd his Mind, by such a discharge of his heavy and angry Censures, without much Argument; and declares against Communion in Worship with them, who believe *Jesus Christ to be in his best Nature of finite Dignity and Capacity* (i. e. say the Unitarians, in other words, to be the first-begotten of the Creation, Col. 1. 15. or that the Father is greater than he, as Christ himself speaks.) I say, no question but Mr. Wall takes care that he has no such Communicants in his own Parish, and I think he cannot admit any, of whom he is not rationally assur'd, that they were baptiz'd by sound Catholicks. This is not a matter to be loosely suppos'd in the general, if Baptism be so necessary to Salvation and to Christian Communion, as he seems to suppose it to be.

I do indeed agree with him, that if he and the *Unitarians*, *Arian*, or *Socinian*, do worship two different Gods, as he is inclinable to think, pag. 78. he cannot be too wary in admitting 'em. I cannot see, says he, *that we worship the same God*, since our God is *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; i. e. the *Unitarians* take the first Command according to the Letter, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but Me*. But Mr. Wall, &c. interprets it, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but us Three*, and therefore they worship not the same God. But then let Mr. Wall consider what follows, That if the *Unitarians* worship the true God of *Israel*; that God who made all things, the *God and Father of our Lord Jesus*, and the same God which *Jesus Christ* worship'd (who never is said to worship any but his *Father*) then it follows, that if Mr. Wall worships another God, 'tis not that true God; and then I doubt he will hardly have the Honour, he derides the *Socinians* with, of being admitted to wear a white *Turbant* in *Stambole*. He must e'en go a little farther off, and among some of the remote *Indians* may perhaps find some Associates, with whom to have brotherly and unenvy'd Communion. I only mention this, to shew him the Consequence of his rash Zeal; not that I think he really is for another God than the *Socinians* or *Arians*, tho' of that God he may have other Notions, as the several sorts of *Trinitarians* have different Conceptions of him from each other. I pray God preserve him from gratifying his Passion and Aversion to *Arians*, &c. at so dear a rate, as the renouncing the true God for their believing in him, or the admitting many Gods because they hold but one.

At this rate, how many different Gods might an envious Mind tax the Christians with? Thus the several sorts of *Trinitarians* will have several Gods: Our God, says one *Trinitarian*, is *Three Infinite Minds*; but, says another sort, our God is but one *Infinite Mind*, with three Modes or Somewhats, &c. Ergo, they don't worship the same God, according to Mr. Wall. So the *Armians* and *Calvinists* will have two Gods; for says one side, Our God is of a *Nature* holy and good, he can't will Sin and the Misery of his Creatures: Our God, says the other, does will and decree Sin, and makes Men do it, to please himself in their Damnation, as an Act of Sovereignty; Ergo, we have not the same God, nor of the same Nature. This is a fine healing Method which Mr. Wall is setting up!

Many have wondred how it comes to pass that the *Unitarians*, who have the most to say for themselves, and whose Arguments are serious, sober and pertinent, by Confession of their Opposers, should yet be run down with more Odium and bitter Censures than any other Sect: but the Solution is not difficult; for when once any Party, either by the Constitution of their Church, or by the sacred Ties of a beneficial Incom, are oblig'd to subscribe, or openly pronounce the *undoubted everlasting*



This will ease us of many bitter Controversys about *Baptism*, as whether by Immersion or Effusion? Whether Infants or Adult Persons are to be baptiz'd in a Christian Church? Whether by Bishop or Presbyter? Since we are all generally descended from some or other Ancestors, that no doubt have been regularly baptiz'd: Nay this may probably prove Quakers to be of the Christian Church still, tho not baptiz'd themselves, while they are the Seed of baptiz'd Parents, and still own Christianity, as they understand it. Nay this may give great ease to the Clergy, and particularly to Mr. Wall, who, p. 134. is very much against the Doctrine which involves the Baptizer in endless Scruples, which Infants he may baptize, and which not: and therefore is for Baptism of all Children, the Owners of which desire Baptism for them, p. 381. But tho this be a compendious way of ending Scruples as to the Subjects of Baptism, yet even still there are many Scruples will meet him again at another turn on his Principles. For

If every Christian must have a particular Baptism duly administered to himself, and may not be admitted to the Eucharist without such Baptism, then 'tis incumbent on the Administrator or Presbyter to examine into the validity of the Baptism of every Communicant: As whether he ever was baptiz'd, or not? By whom? Whether by a Catholick, or a Schismatick, or Heretick? Whether by a *Tribest*, or a *Socinian*? Whether by one ordain'd aright, or an Intruder? I confess I don't think these Matters are inquir'd into, in order to Communion either with the Church or Dissenters, except in some Points by the Antipedobaptists, who usually place their main Zeal in this Article; yet I must think these are needful Questions concerning a Communicant, if a true authentick Baptism be necessary to Christian-Communion, and to Salvation among Christians.

It would be hard to question Mr. Wall's great care in these matters, especially now there are, as he owns, so many *Soci-nians* in the Church, and out of it; against whom he has eas'd his Mind, by such a discharge of his heavy and angry Censures, without much Argument; and declares against Communion in Worship with them, who believe *Jesus Christ to be in his best Nature of finite Dignity and Capacity* (i. e. say the *Unitarians*, in other words, to be the *first-begotten of the Creation*, Col. 1. 15. or that *the Father is greater than he*, as Christ himself speaks.) I say, no question but Mr. Wall takes care that he has no such Communicants in his own Parish, and I think he cannot admit any, of whom he is not rationally assur'd, that they were baptiz'd by sound Catholicks. This is not a matter to be loosely suppos'd in the general, if Baptism be so necessary to Salvation and to Christian Communion, as he seems to suppose it to be.

I do indeed agree with him, that if he and the *Unitarians*, *Arian*, or *Socinian*, do worship two different Gods, as he is inclinable to think, pag. 78. he cannot be too wary in admitting 'em. I cannot see, says he, that we worship the same God, since our God is *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*; i. e. the *Unitarians* take the first Command according to the Letter, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but Me*. But Mr. Wall, &c. interprets it, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but us Three*, and therefore they worship not the same God. But then let Mr. Wall consider what follows, That if the *Unitarians* worship the true God of *Israel*; that God who made all things, the *God and Father of our Lord Jesus*, and the same God which *Jesus Christ* worship'd (who never is said to worship any but his *Father*) then it follows, that if Mr. Wall worships another God, 'tis not that true God; and then I doubt he will hardly have the Honour, he derides the *Socinians* with, of being admitted to wear a white *Turbant* in *Stambole*. He must e'en go a little farther off, and among some of the remote *Indians* may perhaps find some Associates, with whom to have brotherly and unenvy'd Communion. I only mention this, to shew him the Consequence of his rash Zeal; not that I think he really is for another God than the *Socinians* or *Arians*, tho' of that God he may have other Notions, as the several sorts of *Trinitarians* have different Conceptions of him from each other. I pray God preserve him from gratifying his Passion and Aversion to *Arians*, &c. at so dear a rate, as the renouncing the true God for their believing in him, or the admitting many Gods because they hold but one.

At this rate, how many different Gods might an envious Mind tax the Christians with? Thus the several sorts of *Trinitarians* will have several Gods: Our God, says one *Trinitarian*, is *Three Infinite Minds*; but, says another sort, our God is but one *Infinite Mind*, with three Modes or Somewhats, &c. Ergo, they don't worship the same God, according to Mr. Wall. So the *Armians* and *Calvinists* will have two Gods; for says one side, Our God is of a Nature holy and good, he can't will Sin and the Misery of his Creatures; Our God, says the other, does will and decree Sin, and makes Men do it, to please himself in their Damnation, as an Act of Sovereignty; Ergo, we have not the same God, nor of the same Nature. This is a fine healing Method which Mr. Wall is setting up!

Many have wondred how it comes to pass that the *Unitarians*, who have the most to say for themselves, and whose Arguments are serious, sober and pertinent, by Confession of their Opposers, should yet be run down with more Odium and bitter Censures than any other Sect: but the Solution is not difficult; for when once any Party, either by the Constitution of their Church, or by the sacred Ties of a beneficial Incom, are oblig'd to subscribe, or openly pronounce the *undoubted everlasting*



*Perdition* of their Brethren, then the next thing likely to be done by a considerate Man (whose Heart smites him for it as a harsh uncommon piece of Cruelty) is to devise, and strain, and aggravate Matters as ill as he can, that he may make those Persons look something like such as are fit to be thus curs'd and damn'd by him; since curs'd and damn'd, with great Solemnity, they must needs be: Lest if they should be thus censur'd without a Cause, that Text, *Judg not, that ye be not judg'd*, Mat. 7. 1, 2. might bode them ill, and frighten them with that same Damnation which with such undoubting Confidence they have openly denounc'd against their Brethren. That therefore they may be able to perform their part heartily, 'tis requisite to make things look as bad as possibly they can on the *Unitarians* side, and to imagine these worship another God, and blaspheme Jesus Christ, &c. that so without relenting, they may, in open view, cheerfully offer 'em up to the forest Indignation of God for ever; which if they do escape, 'twill be without much Thanks due to the Disciples of *Vigilius Thapsensis*.

This is the more unreasonable in Mr. Wall, for that he has given us two Characters of fundamental Doctrines, which will go very far to clear the *Unitarians* from the Charge of Error in Fundamentals, p. 547, 548. Three Persons in one and the same God, or Infinite Mind, being never expressly or clearly and plainly deliver'd in any Text of Scripture, whatever proof be pretended from remote Consequences, which some sincere Persons cannot perceive, no not with the help of an early Education therein, and a strong bias too from great worldly Interests, which are not wont to blind the Eyes in favour of the losing side of a Question. Nor was it in the next place put into the most antient *Creeds*, witness the common antient *Creed*, call'd the *Apostles Creed*; nay even the *Nicene Creed* never determin'd the equality of the Third Person to the Father, and therefore a part of the *Constantinopolitan Creed* is tack'd to the end of it, and now-a-days it passes all together for the *Nicene Creed*, as the Learned well know.

But to return (after this digression made necessary by Mr. Wall's Warmth against the *Unitarians*) to the Argument of Baptism; I am sensible one Question may arise, from what has been said about the not baptizing the Seed of Believers, *viz.* Whether a Person may communicate at the Lord's Table who is born in Christianity of baptiz'd Parents, but has not been himself baptiz'd in Person? But this will easily be determin'd by what has been said, according to the Strength or Weakness of my main Argument.

For tho Mr. W— says, *Of all Absurditys none ever maintain'd that the Unbaptiz'd should communicate*; yet if he will not allow the Seed of baptiz'd Parents, for baptiz'd Persons by virtue of their Christian Birth, he must either shew that the Offspring of Believers

lievers were in Person baptiz'd in the early beginnings of Christianity, or there will be some ground to suppose, that what he accounts an Absurdity was the first Practice; and that Christians did communicate by virtue of their Birth-Privilege, as the Seed of baptiz'd Parents: since they who were bound to communicate, were not (as far as yet appears) bound to be, in their immediate Persons, baptiz'd.

And if we look to the *Jewish* Custom, in relation to the *Postcænum* of the Passover, whence our Lord took the occasion of instituting his Supper, we may find yet more countenance for our Supposition, in that all the *Female-Communicants* were admitted without Baptism, or any other requir'd Badg of Initiation; so that they were but such as descended from circumcis'd Parents, tho the *Males*, on some other account, were to be first circumcis'd. Whence it appears, that if we make the Case of Admission to the Lord's Supper parallel to this, we can only say, That such as are requir'd to be baptiz'd, must be so before they communicate, and no others: and then this resolves the Business into the extent of the Command for Baptism, whether it reach to the Seed of Profelytes, or not; otherwise there is no necessity from the nature of the Ordinances themselves, that all should be solemnly initiated by a Cêremony before communicating.

Now upon the whole, as I have no Interest, Party, nor Prejudice to serve (which scarcely any but a Layman can truly say) so I am not dogmatical, nor positive in the Matter, but only propound it as a Problem: Nor will I violently defend it, but shall be altogether as well pleas'd to see my Argument fairly confuted, as any one shall be to undertake it; and will conclude with Mr. Baxter's Words (in his *Catholick Communion doubly defended*) *I flatter no Party, and I look to gain by none: I have gather'd no Church to depend on for Kindness, nor is the fear of displeasing them a Bias to my Judgment.*

F I N I S.



lavers were in Boston during the early beginning of the  
winter, or there will be some ground to suppose, that what he  
narrates as a fact was the result of a vision; and that Christ  
himself communicated by vision to those of his Birth-Privileges  
the story of David's Father; that they who were bound to  
communicate, were not (as it appears) bound to do in  
their immediate personal reports.

And it would be the better (I think) in relation to the  
evidence of the Father, when our Lord took the resolution  
to induce his Father, we may see how more convincing for  
our supposition, in that all the time of his Father's  
vision without doubt, or any other kind of kind of vision  
than; to that they were bound to be distinguished from themselves  
themselves, and the Father, on some other account, were to be  
communicated. Whether it appears that if we make the Father  
distinct from the Father's Father, we are only  
laying down such as are required to be a vision, and so in no  
less they communicate, and no other; and then the Father  
the Father's Father, and the Father's Father, who  
then it is that the Father's Father, and the Father's Father  
is no necessary from the nature of the Father's Father  
that all should be solemnly believed by a testimony from com-  
municating.

Now upon the whole, as  
Proposed to give (which  
I say) to I am not  
only proposed in as a Father  
but shall be altogether as well  
confined, as any one shall be  
only with the Father's Father  
and I am not, and I am not  
and I am not, and I am not  
and I am not, and I am not



1713

